PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

IMPERIALISM AND THE REVOLUTION

TIRANA, 1979

THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST STUDIES
AT THE CC OF THE PLA

THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE

ENVER HOXHA

*FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION**

From the time the «Manifesto of the Communist Party» of Marx and Engels was published in 1848 to this day the struggle between revolutionary Marxism and opportunism, in both the political and the ideological fields, has centered around one problem: is the revolution necessary for the transformation of society to a socialist basis or not, do the conditions exist to carry out the revolution or not, can it be carried out in the peaceful way, or is revolutionary violence indispensable?

With all their theories, of which there are scores if not hundreds, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists have always tried to negate the incontrovertible truth that the fundamental contradiction of capitalist society is that between the exploiters and the exploited, to deny the place and role of the working class in history, and to negate the class struggle itself as the determining factor of the development and progress of human society. Their aim has always been to disorientate the proletariat ideologically, to hinder the revolution, perpetuate capitalist exploitation, and to de-

* In Albanian.

stroy Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant science of the revolution and the construction of socialism.

All these opponents and enemies of the proletariat and the revolution have tried to proclaim Marxism-Leninism outdated and to create various «theories», allegedly adapted to the new historical conditions, to the changes that capitalism and imperialism have undergone, and the evolution of human society in general.

Thus Bernstein proclaimed Marx outdated, and Kautsky, deliberately misinterpreting the transition of capitalism to imperialism, negated the revolution. Their example and methods have been followed by all the modern revisionists, too, ranging from Browder and Tito, Khrushchev and the «Eurocommunists», to the Chinese «theoreticians» of «three worlds».

Under the false pretext that they are implementing and developing Marxism-Leninism in a «creative manner», adapting it to the new conditions existing in the world today, all these anti-Marxists are trying to negate the scientific ideology of the working class and to replace it with bourgeois opportunism.

The proletariat, the revolutionaries and their genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have always waged an unrelenting stern struggle against modern revisionism and its various trends, and this struggle will never cease.

The revisionists, the reactionary bourgeoisie and its parties try to label our theory, Marxism-Leninism, a dogma, something rigid, petrified, which allegedly cannot adapt itself to the contemporary realities of the time which are full of dynamism and life. But speaking of dynamism and vitality, Marxism-Leninism is the only theory with these qualities, because it is the theory of the working class, the most advanced class of society, the most revolutionary class, which thinks correctly. which produces the material blessings and is always in activity.

The efforts of the bourgeoisie and its ideologists who are trying to convince mankind that Marxism-Leninism is allegedly outdated and out of step with «modern times», are intended to combat the scientific ideology of the proletariat and to replace it with theories which preach a degenerate life, the life of a lumpen, a society of unrestrained degeneration, a so-called consumer society. The theories which claim that the forms of a new society in continuous movement and advance have now allegedly been found, are also intended to deal a blow at the progressive revolutionary thinking of the proletariat, at the ideology guiding it, as well as to perpetuate capitalist oppression and exploitation.

Our theory, as Lenin teaches us, judges and defines the forms and methods of class struggle correctly. It remains closely linked with the prac-

tical problems arising from life, from the epoch. This weapon helps us to analyse and understand correctly the course of development of human society at every moment, to analyse and understand correctly every historic turning-point of society and to carry out the revolutionary transformation of society.

At its 7th Congress, our Party exposed all the different revisionist currents, including the Chinese theory of «three worlds». Stressing the vital importance of Marxism-Leninism for the triumph of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples, it resolutely rejected the bourgeois-opportunist theses and views on the present stage of the world historical process, which repudiate the revolution and defend capitalist exploitation, and emphasized strongly that no change in the evolution of capitalism and imperialism justifies the revisionist «inventions» and fabrications. Principled criticism and ceaseless exposure of the anti-revolutionary and anti-communist theories are absolutely necessary to defend Marxism-Leninism, to carry forward the cause of the revolution and the peoples, to demonstrate that the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is always young, and remains the unerring guide to future victories.

April 1978.

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The book «Imperialism and the Revolution» was first published [in Albanian] in April 1978 for distribution within the Party.

In accord with the wishes of the communists who have read this book, it is now made available to the public. Some events that have taken place during the period since the first publication have also been included.

December 1978.

PART ONE

I

THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM

In analysing the present international situation and the situation of the world revolutionary movement, the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania pointed out the dangers imperialism and modern revisionism represent for the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, stressed the need for a merciless fight against them and the active support that must be given to the Marxist-Leninist movement in the world.

These questions have great importance because the construction of socialism, the struggle to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat and the defence of the Homeland are inseparable from the international situation and the general process of world development.

Today big forces, representatives of darkness, of the enslavement and exploitation of the proletariat and the peoples — American imperialism and its agencies, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism, the big bourgeoisie and reaction, have risen against and are fighting Marxism-Leninism. Such counterrevolutionary ideological currents as social-democracy, modern revisionism and many other counterrevolutionary currents have also risen against our revolutionary ideology.

In our struggle against all these enemies we must base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory and the world proletariat. Our struggle on the theoretical plane will be crowned with success when we make a correct dialectical analysis of the international situation, of events which are developing, the objectives and aims of all the social forces in motion, which are in contradiction and struggle with one another. Scientific analysis of the international situation and clarification of the strategy of the revolutionary struggle help us define the correct tactics in differing circumstances, in order to win battle after battle. That is how our Party has always acted.

Socialism is in struggle with capitalism, the world proletariat is locked in a merciless and continuous struggle with the capitalist bourgeoisie, the peoples of the world are in struggle with their external and internal oppressors. The world proletariat is guided in the struggle by its Marxist-

Leninist ideology, which explains the necessity for this struggle and mobilizes the forces in battle. This is why capitalism and imperialism have always organized a bitter struggle against the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Karl Marx discovered the laws of social development, of revolutionary transformations and the transition of society from a lower to a higher social order. He made a scientific analysis of private ownership of the means of production, the capitalist mode of distribution and the surplus value which the capitalist seizes. He created the scientific theory on classes and the class struggle, and defined the ways of the struggle of the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie, to destroy the capitalist system, to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and build socialist society.

Various reactionary theoreticians in all countries of the world have striven in every way to denigrate Marx's theory, to throw mud at it, to distort it and combat it. But this theory, which is a true science, has succeeded in dominating progressive human thinking and has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the proletariat and the peoples in the fight against their enemies.

By applying the Marxist theory and developing it further, Lenin gave the proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, a scientific theory on the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin developed Marxism not

only in theory but also in practice. Applying the doctrine of Karl Marx, he led the Bolshevik revolution and carried it through to victory. Lenin's work was further developed by Stalin.

The triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution dealt the first crushing blow to imperialism, the entire world capitalist system. It marked the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism which has grown deeper and deeper.

The creation and consolidation of the Soviet state was a colossal victory which showed the proletariat and the peoples that the enemy they faced, capitalism and imperialism, could be conquered and destroyed. The Soviet Union was the living proof of this.

Infuriated by the loss the October Revolution in Russia inflicted on it, the imperialist and capitalist world coalition reinforced its instruments of political, economic and military struggle against the new state of the proletarians and the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideology throughout the world. The imperialists, the reactionary bourgeoisie, European and world social-democracy, together with the other parties of capital, prepared the war against the Soviet Union. Together with the Hitlerites, the Italian and Japanese fascists, they also prepared the Second World War.

But in this war the vitality of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, which emerged victorious, was confirmed even more clearly.

After the victory over fascism, great changes in favour of socialism occurred in the world. New socialist states were set up in Europe and Asia. The socialist camp, with the Soviet Union at the head, was created. This was a new great victory for socialism and Marxism-Leninism, and another great defeat for capitalism and imperialism.

The capitalist system came out of the Second World War deeply shaken and with its equilibrium entirely upset. Germany, Japan and Italy emerged from the war as defeated powers with their economies ruined. They lost the political and military positions they had occupied previously. Although they emerged victorious from the war, other imperialist states, such as Great Britain and France, had been so greatly weakened, economically and militarily, that their role as great powers had declined drastically.

The general crisis of capitalism was further deepened with the collapse of the colonial system. As a result of this collapse a series of new national states emerged, while in those countries which still remained colonies or semi-colonies, the liberation movement against the imperialist yoke grew.

These changes created most favourable conditions for the triumph of socialism on a world scale. Because of the deep economic and political crisis and the growing discontent of the masses, many capitalist states were on the verge of revolutionary outbreaks. In these extremely grave and

critical circumstances, American imperialism came to their aid.

Unlike the other imperialist powers, the United States of America emerged stronger from the war. Not only had it suffered no damage, but it had accumulated colossal wealth and had immensely increased its economic and military potential, and its technical-scientific base. Fattened on the blood shed by the peoples, this imperialism became the sole *leadership** of the entire capitalist world.

American imperialism mobilized all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world to rescue the old capitalist order and crush any revolutionary and national liberation movement which endangered it, to destroy the socialist camp and restore capitalism in the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy and to establish its hegemony everywhere in the world.

To attain its objectives, US imperialism, along with world capital, set in motion its gigantic bureaucratic-military state machine, its great economic, technical and financial potential, all its human forces. US imperialism assisted the political, economic and military recovery of the shattered European and Japanese capitalism and, in place of the collapsed colonial system, set up a new system of exploitation and plunder — neocolonialism.

* English in the original.

American imperialism mobilized its many means of propaganda, its philosophers, economists, sociologists, writers, etc., in the frenzied campaign which began against Marxism-Leninism, against communism, against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of Europe and Asia.

At the same time, American imperialism implemented an openly aggressive policy. Every field of life, the economy, politics, ideology, the army and science, in the United States of America was swept by war fever, militarization and anti-communism.

To conquer socialism, to put down the revolutionary liberation movements, to combat the great influence of the Marxist-Leninist theory and establish its hegemony in the world, American imperialism went about it in two ways.

The first was that of aggression and armed intervention. The American imperialists set up aggressive military blocs such as NATO, SEATO etc., stationed armed forces in large numbers on the territories of many foreign countries, set up military bases on all continents, and built powerful naval fleets which they deployed throughout the seas and oceans. In order to crush and stamp out the revolution, they undertook military intervention in Greece, Korea, Vietnam and elsewhere.

The other way was that of ideological aggression and subversion against the socialist states, the communist and workers' parties, and of

efforts to bring about the bourgeois degeneration of these states and parties. In this direction, American imperialism and world capital as a whole employed powerful means of propaganda and ideological diversion.

But American imperialism and world capitalism, which was recovering after the war, were facing a powerful adversary, the socialist camp with the Soviet Union at the head, the world proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples. Therefore they had to be very careful in their reckoning with this colossal power, which was guided by a correct and clear policy, by a triumphant ideology which had captured and was more and more capturing the hearts and minds of workers, revolutionaries and progressive elements.

Despite the efforts of US imperialism and world reaction to crush and destroy the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the liberation struggle of the peoples, they were mounting and growing stronger. Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Union very quickly healed the wounds of war and was advancing at rapid rates in all fields, in the economy, science, technology, etc. In the countries of people's democracy the positions of socialism were being consolidated. The communist parties and the anti-imperialist democratic movement were extending their influence among the masses.

In these conditions, world imperialism and

capitalism utilized the modern revisionists, and the Yugoslav ones among the first, in their fight against socialism and the liberation movements of the peoples.

It was a stroke of good luck for world capitalism that Yugoslavia, a country called a people's democracy, came out in opposition to, and entered into open ideological and political conflict with, the Soviet Union, because within the ranks of the socialist camp one member country had rebelled. World capitalism gave great publicity to this event, which helped it in its fight against socialism and the revolution.

But although it inflicted great harm on the cause of the revolution and socialism, the Titoite betrayal did not succeed in splitting the socialist camp and the communist movement, as the bourgeoisie and reaction hoped. The communists and revolutionaries all over the world sternly condemned this treachery and pointed out the danger posed by Titoism, as an agency of imperialism against communism.

It was the Khrushchevite revisionists, who seized power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death, that rendered the greatest service to world capitalism in its fight against socialism, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism. The emergence of the revisionist group of Khrushchev was the greatest political and ideological victory for the

strategy of imperialism after the Second World War.

The counterrevolutionary overthrow in the Soviet Union caused immense rejoicing among the US imperialists and all the other capitalist powers, because the most powerful socialist state, the bastion of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples, was abandoning the road of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and would be transformed, in theory and practice, into a base of the counterrevolution and capitalism.

The about-turn which took place in the Soviet Union led to the split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It was one of the main factors which influenced the spread of modern revisionism in many communist parties and created favourable conditions for this. The Khrushchevite revisionist trend gravely damaged the cause of the revolution and socialism throughout the world.

A stern struggle began between the genuine Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary forces, on the one hand, and Khrushchevite revisionism, on the other. Right from the start, the Party of Labour of Albania raised high the banner of implacable and principled struggle against Soviet revisionism and its followers, courageously defended Marxism-Leninism, the cause of socialism and the liberation of the peoples, just as it had fought and was fighting resolutely against Yugoslav revisionism.

All over the world, the genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, also, rose against the Khrushchevite betrayal. From the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat of different countries emerged new Marxist-Leninist parties, which shouldered the heavy burden of leading the struggle of the working class and the peoples against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and modern revisionism.

The hopes of imperialism and revisionism of finally destroying socialism, extinguishing the genuine international communist movement and crushing the peoples' struggle were not realized. The Khrushchevite revisionists soon revealed their anti-Marxist and counterrevolutionary features. The peoples saw that the Soviet Union had been transformed into an imperialist superpower, which was contending with the United States of America for world domination, that, along with US imperialism, it had become another great enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the world.

On the other hand, the grave economic, financial, ideological and political crisis which swept the entire capitalist and revisionist world, not only showed the further decay of the capitalist system and its unalterable oppressive and exploiting nature clearly, but also exposed the demagogy and hypocrisy of all modern revisionists, who were prettifying the capitalist order.

But at the time when the revolutionary

movement was growing and becoming consolidated throughout the world, when capitalism was being squeezed ever more tightly in the grip of the crisis, and when Khrushchevite revisionism and the other trends of modern revisionism were becoming exposed in the eyes of the proletariat and the peoples, Chinese revisionism came out openly on the world scene. It became the close ally of US imperialism and the big international bourgeoisie to smother and sabotage the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples.

A very complex situation has been created in the world at present. Operating in the international arena today are various imperialist and social-imperialist forces which, on the one hand, are fighting in unison against the revolution and the freedom of the peoples, and on the other hand, are contesting and clashing with one another over markets, spheres of influence and hegemony. Now, in addition to the Soviet-American rivalry for world domination, there are the expansionist claims of Chinese social-imperialism, the predatory ambitions of Japanese militarism, the strivings of West-German imperialism for vital space, the fierce competition of the European Common Market, which has turned its eyes towards the old colonies.

All these factors have further exacerbated the many contradictions of the capitalist and revisionist world. At the same time, the prospect of

the revolution and the peoples' liberation has not been eliminated as a result of the betrayal of the Titoite, Soviet, Chinese and other revisionists, but, on the contrary, after a temporary set-back, the revolution is now on the verge of a fresh leap forward. It will certainly forge ahead on the course history has set for it and will triumph on a world scale.

Nothing can save imperialism, capitalism and revisionism from the remorseless vengeance of the proletariat and the peoples, nothing can rescue them from deep antagonistic contradictions and never-ending crises, revolutions, their inevitable demise.

It is precisely this situation which is driving imperialism to seek new roads and paths, to build new strategies and tactics, in order to escape the catastrophe awaiting it.

The Strategy of World Imperialism

US imperialism and the other capitalist states have fought and are fighting to maintain their hegemony in the world, to defend the capitalist and neo-colonialist system, to emerge from the great crisis which has them in its grip, with the fewest possible losses. They have striven and are striving to prevent the peoples and the proletariat from fulfilling their revolutionary aspirations for liber-

ation. US imperialism, which dominates its partners politically, economically and militarily, has the main role in the struggle to achieve these aims.

The enemies of the revolution and the peoples want to create the impression that, because of the changes that have occurred in the world and the losses that socialism has suffered, circumstances entirely different from those of the past have been created. Therefore, although they have fierce contradictions with one another, US imperialism and the world capitalist bourgeoisie, Soviet social-imperialism and Chinese social-imperialism, modern revisionism and social-democracy are seeking a *modus vivendi,* a hybrid «new society», in order to keep the bourgeois-capitalist system on its feet, to avert revolutions and to continue their oppression and exploitation of the peoples in new forms and by new methods.

Imperialism and capitalism have come to understand that now they can no longer exploit the peoples of the world with the previous methods, therefore, provided their system is not threatened, they have to concede something, which will cause them no harm, in order to keep the masses in bondage. This they want to do with the investments and credits they distribute to those states and cliques in which they have established their influence or by means of arms, i.e., local wars, either by taking a direct part in them or by inciting one state against another. Local wars serve to

make those countries which fall into its trap more deeply subject to the hegemony of world capital.

All the «theoreticians» in the service of world capital, in the West and in the East, are trying to find the formulae for this «new society». At present they have this «new» form in the capitalist-revisionist society of the Soviet Union, which is nothing but a degenerate society, they have found it in the capitalist system of Yugoslav «self-administration» and in some so-called socialist oriented regimes of the «third world». They are trying to find a capitalist «new society» of this type also in the Chinese variant, which is now crystallizing.

From the programmatic statements which President Carter made on May 22, 1977, in which he presented the outlines of an allegedly new policy of the United States of America, it is clear that the general and fundamental characteristic of this «new policy» in the present conditions is the fight of this superpower to cope with the proletarian revolution and the national liberation wars of peoples who aspire to liberate themselves from the yoke of big world capital, especially from US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

As we pointed out in the foregoing, the capitalist world is searching for a way out of the abyss, even if only for the time being. Naturally, US imperialism is striving to find this way out and, possibly, to co-ordinate it with Soviet social-

imperialism, with its NATO allies, with China, as well as with other industrialized capitalist countries. Carter appealed to the Eastern, Western and the OPEC member countries and demanded that they work together and «effectively help the poorer countries». US imperialism tries to present this collaboration as the only alternative to wars, the only way to stop wars.

In his speech, the US President said, today «we have been freed from that constant fear of communism, which at one time led us to embrace every dictator who was obsessed by the same fear».

Of course, when Carter, this faithful representative of the bloodiest imperialism of our time, speaks of being «freed from the fear of communism», he means communism à la Yugoslav, à la Khrushchev, à la Chinese, whose masks only are communist, but the capitalist bourgeoisie has not been and will never be freed from the fear of genuine communism. On the contrary, imperialism and social-imperialism have always been terrified of genuine communism and they will be even more terrified of it. It is this fear and dread that are driving the imperialists and the revisionists into each others' arms, to co-ordinate their plans and seek the most appropriate forms in order to prolong the existence of their rule of oppression and exploitation.

In these moments of deep economic, political

and military crisis, the imperialists of the United States of America are trying to consolidate the victories of imperialism, attained through the betrayal by modern revisionism in the Soviet Union, the former countries of people's democracy and in China, and to use them as a barrier against the revolution and the revolutionary liberation struggle of the proletariat and the peoples.

The US President also admits that, out of fear of communism, in the past the capitalists and the imperialists embraced and supported the fascist dictators like Mussolini, Hitler, Hirohito, Franco, etc. The fascist dictatorships in the respective countries were the ultimate weapon of the capitalist bourgeoisie and world imperialism against the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin and against the world proletarian revolution.

The US President declares with an air of confidence that the communist (read: revisionist) states have altered their appearance, and he is not mistaken in this. He says, «this system could not last for ever unchanged». Of course, he is confusing the revisionist treachery with the genuine socialist system, with communism. US imperialism considers the Khrushchevite Soviet system as a victory of world capitalism and from this it deduces that the threat of a conflict with the Soviet Union has become less intense, though it does not deny the contradictions and rivalry for hegemony with it.

According to Carter, the US government will make every effort to maintain the status quo. In other words, this means that both US imperialism and the other imperialist states will strive to maintain and strengthen their positions in the world, while they hope that together, they can solve the disagreements which may exist, and which in fact do exist, with friendly countries and their allies, within this status quo.

As a conclusion, says Carter, «the US policy must be based on a new, wider mosaic of global, regional and bilateral interests». After analysing this new, wider «mosaic» of global, regional and bilateral interests, he reaffirms that «the United States of America will honour all its commitments to NATO, which must be a strong organization, because the alliance of the United States of America with the great industrialized democracies is indispensable, since it defends the same values, and therefore we all should fight for a better life».

As can be seen, the United States of America, too, is joining the Soviet modern revisionists, the Chinese revisionists and the «big industrialized democracies» in their efforts to create a «new reality», a «new world». In other words, through demagogy, the United States of America is trying to adapt its policy to the new situations. In order to maintain the status quo, to halt the drive of Soviet hegemonism, to weaken Soviet social-imperialism and to win China over to its side, so that it is ever

more deeply committed to the imperialist camp, in order to quell the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the peoples, the United States of America has to make some phoney political concessions. But it is making no concessions in military matters, no concessions in the policy of keeping the states and the peoples in bondage and under control, in the policy of the exploitation of the national wealth of the other countries to its own advantage and that of the industrialized countries.

This is the «new policy» of the United States of America. It is clear to us that this is by no means a new policy, but an old predatory imperialist, neo-colonialist, enslaving policy of ruthlessly exploiting the peoples and their wealth, a policy of putting down revolutions and national liberation wars. US imperialism now wants to give this old, permanent policy an allegedly new, fresh coat of paint, to arm counterrevolutionary elements, whether in power or not, with weapons to fight communism which raises the peoples and the proletariat in liberation wars and revolution.

Contrary to the Chinese theory of «three worlds», which is a fraudulent capitalist and revisionist theory, US imperialism is still on the offensive. It is striving to preserve its old alliances and to create new ones to its own advantage and to the disadvantage of Soviet social-imperialism or whoever else might threaten US imperialist pow-

er. In particular it is trying to strengthen NATO, which has been and remains an aggressive political and military organization.

In all its strategic manoeuvring the United States of America is not aggravating its relations with the Soviet Union beyond a certain point and is continuing the SALT negotiations with it, although Carter stated that it was going ahead with the production of neutron bombs. Despite this, between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, there is an obvious tendency towards maintaining the status quo.

Of course, while the United States of America and NATO are striving to preserve this status quo with the Soviet Union, at the same time, they have contradictions with it, but these contradictions have not yet reached such a level as to justify the Chinese refrain that war in Europe is imminent.

At present, US imperialism is supporting China so that it becomes stronger militarily and economically. US capital is pouring into China, where not only the principal American banks, but also the American state, are making large investments through credits.

The United States of America is playing the China card heavily, but is hedging its bets. At the same time it is continuing to play the card of Japan, too. The United States of America wants smooth waters between itself and Japan, wants

the aid between them to be mutual so that Japan, according to the American aims, will be strengthened and become like an Israel in the Far East, the Pacific, South-east Asia and, why not, if required and when the time comes, in its confrontation with China too, eventually.

This is the situation in which China signed the treaty of friendship and co-operation with Japan. But this treaty has begun to assume major dangerous and ugly proportions for the fate of the world from many angles, and it will do in the future, because close economic and military collaboration will be established between Japan and China, which will have as its objective the creation of separate and joint spheres of influence, particularly in Asia, Australia and the whole Pacific basin. Naturally, this collaboration will begin to be built under the shadow of the alliance with the United States of America and the propaganda of war against Soviet social-imperialism. The main aim of this Sino-Japanese alliance is the containment and weakening of the Soviet Union, its eviction from Siberia, Mongolia and elsewhere, the elimination of its influence in the whole of Asia and Oceania, and all the ASEAN member countries.

This is the strategy of US imperialism, but at the same time, also of Chinese imperialism and Japanese militarism. The United States of America will try to assist China and Japan and keep

them under its direction, to strengthen the alliance with them and hurl them against the Soviet Union. But there is also the possibility that the day may come when the diabolic, hypocritical, empire-building, unprincipled policy in the imperialist-militarist spirit, pursued by China and Japan, will turn against the superpower which helped them to recover, just as Germany did in the past, when it became a terrible fascist power, attacked the allies of the United States of America and went to war even with the latter, in the time of Hitler.

The United States of America will try to hold the balance between the Chinese power and the rising Japanese power. But one fine morning, this balance will slip from its grasp and the Sino-Japanese imperialist-militarist alliance will become a threat not only to the Soviet Union, but also to the United States of America itself, because the interests of these two big imperialist countries of Asia, China and Japan, converge in their aims of domination in Asia and elsewhere, and of weakening US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

In NATO, the United States of America has a dominant position and great military, political and economic influence. However, despite its unity, within NATO a differentiation has begun from the standpoint of the influence of its various member countries and the emergence of one state over the others.

Year by year, the Federal German Republic is becoming stronger within this organization. Its economic and political power and its trade in arms go beyond the bounds of the European Common Market. Now we may say that the policy of West Germany is assuming the features of totalitarian fascist revanchism, seeking to create its own spheres of influence. Naturally, this does not suit either Britain or France, the two original main partners of the United States of America in NATO.

West Germany is seeking the re-unification of the two German states so as to create one powerful state with a great military potential which will be a threat to Soviet social-imperialism and, in case of a general conflagration, in alliance with Japan and China, may become a danger to the whole world. It is developing very close relations with China, in particular. Among the European states, it occupies the main place in trade exchanges with China. West Germany is the biggest and the most powerful European supplier of credits, technology and modern armaments to China.

Britain and France are also very interested in China, therefore they are developing their relations with it. However, China is more interested in Bonn. This is worrying Britain and France, because by becoming stronger, the Federal German Republic may become even more dominant over the other partners of NATO and the European Common Market. Hence we observe that both the

British and the French governments speak of friendship and relations with China, but they do not forget to stress that they want further development of their economic and friendly relations with the Soviet Union, too. Bonn says this, too, but it is rapidly developing its relations with China, which presents itself as the main enemy of the Soviet Union. The fascist group around Strauss, the Hitlerite generals, the powerful real revanchists of Bonn, are openly advertising themselves as China's closest allies. Therefore, China does not regard Federal Germany in the same light as France and Britain.

The Strategy of Soviet Social-imperialism

Having seized state power in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevites set themselves as their main objective the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the restoration of capitalism and the transformation of the Soviet Union into an imperialist superpower.

After they had consolidated their positions following the death of Stalin, Khrushchev and the group around him first of all launched their attack on the Marxist-Leninist ideology and began their struggle to dethrone Leninism by attacking Stalin and levelling against him all the slanders the filthy propaganda of the world capitalist bour-

geoisie had long been fabricating. Thus, the Khrushchevites became the spokesmen and the executors of the wishes of capital against the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the revolution in the Soviet Union. They went to work systematically to liquidate the entire socialist structure of the Soviet Union, they fought to liberalize the Soviet system, to transform the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a bourgeois state, and to transform the socialist economy and culture into a capitalist economy and culture.

The Soviet Union, which had turned into a revisionist country, into a social-imperialist state, built up its own strategy and tactics. The Khrushchevites worked out such a policy as to enable them to disguise all their activity with Leninist phraseology. They elaborated their revisionist ideology in such a way as to palm it off upon the proletariat and the peoples as the «Marxism-Leninism of the new period», so they could tell the communists, inside and outside the country, that «the revolution was continuing in the Soviet Union in the new political, ideological and economic conditions of world development», and not only that this revolution was continuing there, but that this country was allegedly going over to the stage of the construction of a classless communist society, where the party and the state were withering away.

The party was stripped of its attributes as the

vanguard of the working class, as the sole political leading force of the state and society, and was transformed into a party dominated by the apparatchiki and the KGB. The Soviet revisionists called their party the «party of the entire people» and reduced it to such a condition that it could no longer be the party of the working class, but the party of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists preached Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence as the general line of the international communist movement and proclaimed «peaceful competition with US imperialism» as the road to the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and other countries. They also declared that the proletarian revolution had allegedly entered a new stage, that it could triumph also in ways other than the seizure of state power by the proletariat through violence. According to them, state power could be taken in peaceful, parliamentary and democratic ways, through reforms.

Gambling on the name of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, the Khrushchevite revisionists did their utmost to impose this anti-Marxist line of theirs, this revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory in all fields, on all the communist parties of the world. They wanted the communist and workers' parties of the world to adopt this revisionist line and transform themselves into

counterrevolutionary parties, into blind tools of the bourgeois dictatorship, to serve capitalism.

But this was not fully achieved as they desired, first and foremost, because the Party of Labour of Albania remained unwavering in its consistent implementation of Marxism-Leninism and in defence of its purity. At those moments there were some other parties which, for their own, not purely Marxist-Leninist reasons, wavered, did not fully accept the Khrushchevite orientations, while some accepted them reluctantly, but later submitted to them. At those moments, the Communist Party of China, too, opposed the Khrushchevites, but as the facts show, it proceeded from aims and objectives quite the opposite of those which impelled the Party of Labour of Albania to throw itself into the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism.

With their advent to power the Khrushchevites also prepared the platform of their foreign policy. Just like US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, too, based its foreign policy on expansion and hegemonism by means of the armaments race, pressure and blackmail, and military, economic and ideological aggression. The aim of this policy was the establishment of social-imperialist domination over the whole world.

In the Comecon countries, the Soviet Union is implementing a typically neo-colonialist policy. The economies of these countries have been trans-

formed into appendages of the Soviet economy. The Warsaw Treaty serves the Soviet Union to keep these countries under its yoke, enabling it to station there large military forces, which are no different from occupation armies. The Warsaw Treaty is an aggressive military pact which serves the policy of pressure, blackmail and armed intervention of Soviet social-imperialism. The revisionist-imperialist «theories» on «the socialist community», «the socialist division of labour», «limited sovereignty», «socialist economic integration», etc., also serve this neo-colonialist policy.

But Soviet social-imperialism is not satisfied with the domination it exercises over its satellite states. Like the other imperialist states, the Soviet Union is now fighting for new markets, for spheres of influence, to invest its capital in various countries, to monopolize sources of raw materials, to extend its neo-colonialism in Africa, Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.

Soviet social-imperialism has a whole strategic plan which includes a series of economic, political, ideological and military activities for the purpose of extending its expansion and hegemonism.

At the same time the Soviet revisionists are working to undermine the peoples' revolutions and the liberation wars by precisely the same means and methods as those employed by the US imperialists. Usually, the social-imperialists op-

erate through their tools, the revisionist parties, but, according to the occasion and circumstances, they also try to corrupt and bribe the ruling cliques in the undeveloped countries, offer enslaving economic «aid» in order to get a foothold in these countries, stir up armed conflicts among the different cliques, siding with one or the other, organize plots and putsches to bring pro-Soviet regimes to power, and even resort to direct military intervention, as they did, together with the Cubans, in Angola, Ethiopia, and elsewhere.

The Soviet social-imperialists carry out their intervention, their hegemonic, neo-colonialist actions under the disguise of aid to, and support for, the revolutionary forces, the revolution and the construction of socialism. In reality they help the counter-revolution.

The revisionist Soviet Union tries to open the way to realizing its expansionist, neo-colonialist plans, by presenting itself as a country which is pursuing a Leninist and internationalist policy, as an ally, friend and defender of the new national states, the undeveloped countries, etc. The Soviet revisionists preach that, by linking up with the Soviet Union and the so-called socialist community, which they proclaim as the «main motive force of world development today», these countries can advance successfully on the road of freedom and independence, even of socialism. This is why they have also concocted the theories of

the «non-capitalist road of development», countries of «socialist orientation», etc.

Despite what they pretend, the strategy of the Soviet social-imperialists has nothing in common with socialism and Leninism. It is the strategy of a predatory imperialist state which wants to extend its hegemony and domination to all countries on all continents.

This hegemonic and neo-colonialist policy, which the revisionist Soviet Union is pursuing, clashes, as it is bound to do, with the policy which the United States of America is pursuing and which China, too, has set out on. This is a clash of interests among imperialists in their struggle for the redivision of the world. It is precisely these interests and this struggle that pit the one superpower against the other, that impel each of them to use all the forces and means at its disposal to weaken its rival or rivals, although clashes have not yet reached such a degree of exacerbation that they hurl themselves into armed conflicts.

The Strategy of Chinese Social-imperialism

The events and facts are demonstrating ever more clearly that China is sinking deeper and deeper into revisionism, capitalism and imperialism. On this road, it is working to attain a series of strategic objectives, on a national and international level.

On a national level, Chinese social-imperialism has set itself the task of abolishing any measure of a socialist character which may have been taken after liberation, and building in the country a capitalist system in the base and the superstructure, of making China a great capitalist power by the end of this century through the implementation of the so-called «four modernizations», of industry, agriculture, the army and science.

It is striving to create such an internal organization of the country as to ensure the domination of the old and new Chinese capitalist bourgeoisie over the Chinese people. Chinese revisionism is trying to establish this organization and this domination in the fascist way, by means of the club and oppression. It is working to create a unity between the army and the civilian base, so that the latter serve this army of oppression.

The forms and methods which have attracted the attention of the Chinese leadership most and which may be implemented in China are those of the Titoites, especially the system of Yugoslav «self-administration». Many Chinese commissions and delegations of all sectors and profiles have been charged with studying this system and the experience of Yugoslav capitalist «socialism» in general, on the spot.

Already, a start has been made on putting this system and experience into practice in China. On the other hand, however, it is impossible for

the revisionist leaders of China not to see the failures of the Titoite «self-administration», not to bear in mind the conditions of their country which are entirely different from those of Yugoslavia. Besides this, they consider it necessary, also, to borrow many of the capitalist forms and methods, which, according to them, have proved their «effectiveness» in the United States of America, West Germany, Japan and other bourgeois countries. Apparently, the capitalist system which is being built and developed in China will be a hybrid of various revisionist, capitalist and traditional Chinese forms and methods.

To become a big capitalist power, Chinese revisionism needs a period of peace. The slogan of the «great order», issued by the 11th Congress of the Chinese party is linked with this necessity. To ensure such «order» requires a capitalist order of the fascist dictatorial type on the one hand, while on the other hand, peace and compromise among the rival groups, which have always existed in the Chinese party and state, must be maintained without fail. Time will tell to what extent this order and peace will be ensured.

In their policy of turning China into a superpower, the Chinese leaders aim to make economic and military gains from US imperialism, as well as from the developed capitalist countries which are allies of the United States of America.

This policy pursued by China has aroused

keen interest in the capitalist world, especially on the part of US imperialism, which sees in this policy of China a great support for its strategy of maintaining capitalism and imperialism, strengthening neo-colonialism, putting down revolutions and strangling socialism, as well as of weakening its rival, the Soviet Union.

As Carter has declared, US imperialism wants «to collaborate closely with the Chinese». He has stressed: «We consider the US-Chinese relations a central element of our global policy and we look upon China as a key force for peace». China is for the closest possible peaceful coexistence with the United States of America.

With these views and stands, China is lining itself up with those bourgeois-capitalist states which base their existence as states on US imperialism. This turn of China towards imperialism, like that of the Soviet Union and others before it, is becoming more and more a reality with each passing day. This is seen even by the imperialists themselves, who, rejoicing at this «new reality», declare that «the ideological conflicts which divided the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China in the '50s are less apparent today and there is an ever increasing need for collaboration among the superpowers. . .»

The US imperialists, together with President Carter, are ready to provide China with assistance to strengthen its economy and army, of course,

to the degree that interests them. They are patting the backs of the Chinese revisionist leaders because the strategy of China constitutes an important aid for the hegemonic aims of US imperialism.

China applauds the American views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union because it wants to show that they allegedly serve the revolution and the weakening of the most dangerous great power in the world, Soviet social-imperialism. For its part, US imperialism applauds China's views and actions against the revisionist Soviet Union, because, as one of Carter's closest collaborators has put it, «the Sino-Soviet conflict creates a more pluralist kind of global structure», which US imperialism prefers and considers compatible with its notion of «how the world should be organized», or, in other words, how the others should be incited to bump each other off in order to make it easier for the United States of America to dominate the world.

China's pragmatic and venal policy has led it to become an ally of US imperialism and proclaim Soviet social-imperialism as the main enemy and threat. Tomorrow, when China sees that it has achieved its objective of weakening Soviet social-imperialism, when, in its logic, it sees that US imperialism is becoming stronger, since it relies on one imperialism to fight the other, it may continue the fight on the other flank. In this case US imperialism could become the more dan-

gerous and then China must automatically reverse its previous stand.

This is a real possibility. At their 8th Congress in 1956, the Chinese revisionists considered US imperialism the main threat. Later, at their 9th Congress, in April 1969, they proclaimed that the two superpowers, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, comprised the main danger. Later, following the 10th Congress which was held in August 1973, and at the 11th Congress, they proclaimed Soviet social-imperialism alone as the main enemy. With such waverings, with such a pragmatic policy, it is not impossible that the 12th or the 13th Congress could come out in support of Soviet social-imperialism and proclaim US imperalism as the main enemy, and this will go on until China, too, attains its goal of becoming a great capitalist world power. This being the case, what role will China play on the international arena? Its role will never be revolutionary, but regressive and counterrevolutionary.

An important aspect of the Chinese foreign policy is the alliance with Japan. As we pointed out above, this racist alliance between these two states, which was recently sealed with the Sino-Japanese Treaty, is intended to realize the strategic plans of China and Japan for their joint domination of Asia, the ASEAN countries and Oceania. The Chinese revisionists need this treaty and the friendship with Japan, so that,

together with the Japanese militarists, they can threaten Soviet social-imperialism and possibly liquidate it and its influence in Asia.

But China also wants to take advantage of its links with Japan to get credits, to import equipment, technology and armaments from Japan, in order to realize its own great power ambitions. China attaches such importance to its all-round economic collaboration with Japan that more than half its foreign trade is with that country.

In order to implement its expansionist policy, social-imperialist China is working to extend its influence in Asia as much as possible. At present it has no influence at all in India, where both the United States of America and the Soviet Union have their separate and common interests within the context of the changes and alliances which the future may bring. China now wishes to start somewhat better diplomatic relations with India. But India has great pretensions towards Tibet. India will try to liquidate even that little influence China may have in Pakistan, because Pakistan is situated in a strategic position flanking Iran and Afghanistan. The rivalries over the great oil basin of the Middle East, in which US imperialism is dominant, begin there. It is very difficult for China to penetrate there. It will follow a policy against the interests of the Arab peoples and in support of American interests until such time as it becomes strong. At the same time, China will help

the United States of America to set up, jointly with such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia, etc., a powerful barrier to Soviet political, economic and military penetration into this area vital to American and European imperialism.

To achieve their aims, the Chinese social-imperialists are devoting special attention to Western Europe. Their objective is to pit it against Soviet social-imperialism. That is why they support NATO and the alliance of the European countries with the United States of America, the European Common Market and the «United Europe», in every way.

In its strategic plan, social-imperialist China aims to extend its influence and hegemony to the countries of what it calls the «third world». The theory of the «third world» has great importance for China. Mao Tsetung did not proclaim this «theory» as a dreamer, but with definite hegemonic aims that China should dominate the world. His successors are following this same strategy of Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai.

The Chinese strategic ambitions also extend to what is called the «non-aligned world», which Titoism advocates. There is no difference between these «worlds», one overlaps the other. It is hard to distinguish which states belong to the «third world» and what distinguishes them from the «non-aligned countries», which states belong to the «non-aligned» and what distinguishes them

from those of the «third world». Thus, whatever they are called, they are the same states.

This is one of the reasons why the Chinese leadership gives so much importance to maintaining very friendly state and party relations with Tito and Yugoslavia in all fields, ideological, political, economic, or military.

The community of views of the Chinese revisionists and the Yugoslav revisionists does not prevent either of them from exploiting this cordial friendship for their own particular purposes.

Tito is trying to exploit Hua Kuo-feng's declarations about his and the Yugoslav party's loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, about the socialist character of «self-administration», and the «Marxist-Leninist» internal and external policy which the Titoites are allegedly pursuing, in order to show that Tito's exposure for his anti-Marxist deviations, his chauvinist, reactionary and pro-imperialist policy and his revisionism, is nothing but a slander by the Stalinists, and, on this basis, he is seeking to build up his own reputation on the international level.

For his part, Hua Kuo-feng is exploiting relations with Yugoslavia for what is called China's opening to Europe. The Chinese revisionists are also trying to exploit their friendship with the Titoites, who pose as champions of «non-alignment», as an important channel through which to penetrate into the «non-aligned countries» and

establish their domination there. It was not without an ulterior motive that during his visit to Yugoslavia, Hua Kuo-feng praised the «non-aligned» movement to the skies as the «very important force in the struggle of the peoples of the world against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism». He sang the praises of this movement and Tito because he dreams of taking control of this movement and making Peking its centre.

In all its aspects, the policy of Chinese social-imperialism is the policy of a great imperialist power, a counterrevolutionary and warmongering policy, and therefore the peoples will come to hate it, oppose it, and fight it more and more fiercely.

*
* *

The imperialist superpowers, of which we spoke above, will remain imperialist and warmongering, and if not today, tomorrow they will plunge the world into a great nuclear war.

American imperialism is striving to get its hooks ever more deeply implanted into the economies of other peoples, while Soviet social-imperialism, which has just begun to spread its claws, is trying to drive them into various countries of the world in order to create and to consolidate its own neo-colonialist and imperialist positions. But

there is also the «United Europe», linked with the United States of America through NATO, which has individual, not concentrated imperialist tendencies. On the other hand, China, too, has joined in the dance in its endeavours to become a superpower, as well as Japanese militarism which has risen to its feet. These two imperialisms are linking themselves in an alliance in order to form an imperialist power opposed to the others. In these conditions, the great danger of world war is increased. The present alliances exist but will tend to shift in the sense that they will change their directions, but not their content.

The beautiful words poured out about disarmament at the UNO and the various international conferences organized by the imperialists are demagogy. They have created and are guarding their monopoly of strategic weapons and are trafficking in arms on a large scale, not to guarantee the peace and security of nations, but to draw superprofits and to suppress the revolution and the peoples, to unleash aggressive wars. Stalin has said:

> *«The bourgeois states are arming and rearming themselves with a vengeance. What for? Of course, not for talks, but for war. And the imperialists need war, because it is the only means for the redivision of the world, for the redivision of markets,*

*sources of primary materials and spheres for the investment of capital»**.

In their rivalry, which is driving them towards war, the superpowers will certainly cause many partial wars which they will incite between various states of the «third world», the «non-aligned», or the «developing countries».

President Carter has expressed the opinion that war can occur at only two points of the globe, in the Middle East and in Africa. And it is obvious why: because it is precisely in these two regions of the world that the United States of America has greatest interests at the present time. There is the oil in the Middle East, and in rich Africa there is a clash of great neo-colonialist economic and strategic interests over the division of markets and spheres of influence among the superpowers, which are trying to preserve and strengthen their positions and to gain new ones.

However, there are other such areas, apart from the Middle East and Africa, where the interests of the superpowers clash, as for example in Southeast Asia. The United States of America and the Soviet Union, plus China, are striving to establish their spheres of influence and divide the markets. This also gives rise to conflicts, which from time to time turn into local wars, which are in no way intended to liberate the peoples, but to

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, pp. 242-243 (Alb. ed.).

set up or replace ruling cliques representing local capital, cliques which are sometimes with one superpower and sometimes with the other. Soviet social-imperialism and US imperialism are two monsters which the peoples do not trust. Likewise, the peoples do not trust China, either.

When the superpowers fail to achieve their predatory interests through economic, ideological and diplomatic means, when the contradictions become exacerbated to the most acute level, when the agreements and «reforms» prove unable to resolve these contradictions, then the war between them begins. Therefore, the peoples, whose blood will be shed in this war, must strive with might and main not to be caught unawares, to sabotage the predatory inter-imperialist war so that it does not assume world-wide proportions, and if they are unable to achieve this, to turn it into a liberation war and **win.**

The Role of Titoism and Other Revisionist Trends in the Global Strategy of Imperialism and Social-imperialism

In the savage fight which imperialism and social-imperialism, world capitalism and reaction are waging against the revolution, socialism and the peoples, they have the support of the modern revisionists of all trends. These renegades and traitors assist imperialism in the implementation

of its global strategy by undermining from within, splitting and sabotaging the efforts of the proletariat and the struggle of the peoples to get rid of social and national bondage. The modern revisionists have taken upon themselves to denigrate and distort Marxism-Leninism, to confuse people's minds and to alienate them from the revolutionary struggle, to assist capital, to preserve and perpetuate its system of oppression and exploitation.

Along with the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, whom we mentioned above, **the Yugoslav Titoite revisionists play a role of first-rate importance in this great and dangerous counterrevolutionary game.**

Titoism is an old agency of capital, a favourite weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie in its fight against socialism and the liberation movements.

The peoples of Yugoslavia fought self-sacrificingly against the nazi-fascist occupiers for freedom, democracy and socialism. They succeeded in liberating their country, but were not allowed to continue the revolution on the road to socialism. The Yugoslav revisionist leadership with Tito at the head, which had long been worked on secretly by the Intelligence Service and which, during the period of the war, posed as preserving the features of a party of the Third International, in fact, had other aims, which were contrary to Marxism-

Leninism and the aspirations of the peoples of Yugoslavia for the construction of a true socialist society in Yugoslavia.

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which came to power, had inherited many mistakes of a deviationist nature. After the Second World War, it displayed pronounced national-chauvinist features, which had shown up as early as the time of the war. These features were apparent in its departure from the Marxist-Leninist ideology, in its attitude towards the Soviet Union and Stalin, in its chauvinist stands and actions towards Albania, etc.

The system of people's democracy, which was established in Yugoslavia, was temporary. It did not suit the clique in power, though this clique continued to call itself «Marxist». The Titoites were not for the construction of socialism, or for the Communist Party of Yugoslavia to be guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, and they did not accept the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was the source of the conflict that broke out between the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. This was an ideological conflict between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism, and not a conflict between persons over «domination», as the revisionists try to make out. Stalin defended the purity of the Marxist-Leninist theory, Tito defended the deviationist, revisionist, anti-Marxist

trend of modern revisionism, following in the footsteps of Browder and the other opportunists, who emerged on the eve of and during the Second World War.

In the early post-liberation years, the Yugoslav leadership pretended that it was taking the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union as an example and proclaimed that it was allegedly building socialism in Yugoslavia. This was done to deceive the peoples of Yugoslavia who had shed their blood and aspired to genuine socialism.

In fact, the Titoites were not, and could not be, for the socialist social order or the form of organization of the Soviet state, because Tito was for the capitalist system and for an essentially bourgeois-democratic state, in which his clique would hold power. This state was to serve to create the idea that socialism was being built in Yugoslavia, a «specific» socialism of a «more humane type», that is, precisely the kind of «socialism» which would serve as a fifth column in the other socialist countries. Everything was well calculated and co-ordinated by the Anglo-American imperialists and the group around Tito. Thus, by playing the game of imperialism and world capitalism, and coming to terms with them, the Yugoslav revisionists placed themselves in opposition to the Soviet Union.

From the time of the anti-fascist national liberation war, in pursuit of their old plans, British

and, subsequently, US imperialism helped Tito not only to break away from the Soviet Union, but also to carry out acts of sabotage against it, and especially to work to detach other countries of people's democracy from the socialist camp, in order to isolate the Soviet Union from all these countries and unite them with the West. This was the policy of world capitalism and its agency, Titoism.

The rabid anti-communist, Churchill, took a direct and personal part in ensuring that Tito and his group were placed in the service of capitalism. During the war he sent «his most trusted friends», as the British leader put it, and later his own son, to Tito's staff. Eventually, he himself met Tito in Naples of Italy in May 1944, in order to make quite sure that Tito would play no tricks. In his memoirs, Churchill wrote that, in his talks with Tito, the latter expressed his readiness to make a public statement later that «communism would not be established in Yugoslavia after the war».

Tito worked with such great energy to serve his masters that Churchill, appraising his great services, told him: «Now I understand that you were right, therefore I am with you, I like you even more than I did previously». A lover could make no warmer declarations to his love.

Almost before Yugoslavia had broken completely with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, the imperialists, the American imperialists in particular, sent it great

economic, political, ideological and military aid, which became more frequent and constant later on.

This aid was supplied only on condition that the country would develop on the capitalist road. The imperialist bourgeoisie was not against Yugoslavia maintaining its outward socialist forms. On the contrary, it was greatly in its interest that Yugoslavia should keep its outward socialist colour, because in this way it would serve as a more effective weapon in the struggle against socialism and the liberation movements. Not only would this kind of «socialism» be radically different from the socialism envisaged and realized by Lenin and Stalin, but it would even come out against it.

Within a relatively short time Yugoslavia became the «socialist» mouthpiece of US imperialism, a diversionist agency to assist world capital. From 1948 to this day, Titoism has been characterized by feverish activity against Marxism-Leninism to organize a propaganda campaign everywhere in the world to present the Yugoslav system as the form of a «genuine socialist» order, a «new society», a «non-aligned socialism», which is no longer like the socialism Lenin and Stalin built in the Soviet Union, but a socialist order «with a human face» which is being tried for the first time in the world and which is yielding «brilliant results». The aim of this propaganda has always been to lead the peoples and progressive forces

fighting for freedom and independence everywhere in the world up a blind alley.

The Yugoslav revisionists adopted those forms of running their country that the Trotskyites and the other anarchist elements, encouraged by the capitalist bourgeoisie, tried to adopt in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin, in order to sabotage the construction of socialism there. While he talked about building socialism, by adopting these forms, Tito completely distorted the Marxist-Leninist principles on building up industry, agriculture, etc.

The Republics of Yugoslavia assumed such features of administration and organizational political leadership that democratic centralism was liquidated and the role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia faded into insignificance. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia changed its name. It was transformed into the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia», which looks like a Marxist name, while in its content, norms, competences and aims it is anti-Marxist. The League became a spineless front, was stripped of the distinguishing features of a Marxist-Leninist party, preserved the old form, but no longer played the role of the vanguard of the working class, was no longer the political force which led the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, but, according to the Titoite revisionists, allegedly performed only general «educational» functions.

The Titoite leadership placed the party under the control of the UDB, to which it was subordinated, turned it into a fascist organization, and the state into a fascist dictatorship. We know full well the great danger of these activities, for Koçi Xoxe, the agent in the pay of the Titoites, tried to achieve the same thing in Albania.

Tito, Rankovich and their agency entirely liquidated anything which might have had the true colour of socialism. Titoism waged a fierce fight against the attempts of those internal elements who sought to blow up this agency and this capitalist-revisionist organization, as well as against all the Marxist-Leninist propaganda which was conducted abroad to unmask this regime which posed as socialist.

The Titoite leadership quickly abandoned the collectivization of agriculture which had begun in the early years, set up the capitalist state farms, encouraged the development of private property in the countryside, allowed land to be bought and sold freely, rehabilitated the kulaks, left the field free for the private market to flourish in town and country, and carried out the first reforms which strengthened the capitalist direction of the economy.

Meanwhile, the Titoite bourgeoisie was searching for a «new» form to camouflage the Yugoslav capitalist order, and this form was found. They called it Yugoslav «self-administration».

They dressed it up in a «Marxist-Leninist» cloak, claiming that this system was the most authentic socialism.

At first, «self-administration» emerged as an economic system, then it was extended to the field of state organization and all the other fields of life in that country.

The theory and practice of Yugoslav «self-administration» are an open negation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws of the construction of socialism. The economic and political system of «self-administration» is an anarcho-syndicalist form of the bourgeois dictatorship, which is ruling a Yugoslavia dependent on international capital.

The system of «self-administration», with all its characteristic features, such as the elimination of democratic centralism, the role of unified management by the state, anarchist federalism, the anti-state ideology in general, has brought about permanent economic, political and ideological chaos and confusion in Yugoslavia, weak and unequal development of its republics and regions, great social-class differentiations, national feuds and oppression, and the degeneration of spiritual life. It has brought about great fragmentation of the working class, by putting one detachment of it in competition with another, while fostering the bourgeois sectional, localist and individualist spirit. The working class in Yugoslavia

not only does not play the hegemonic role in the state and society, but the system of «self-administration» places it in such conditions that it is unable even to defend its own general interests and to act as a unified and compact class.

From the capitalist world, particularly from US imperialism, large amounts of capital have poured into Yugoslavia in the form of investments, credits and loans. It is precisely this capital which constitutes the material basis of the «development» of Yugoslav capitalist «self-administrative socialism». Its indebtedness alone amounts to over 11 billion dollars. Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits from the United States of America.

Despite the numerous credits the Titoite leadership receives from abroad, the peoples of Yugoslavia have not enjoyed, nor are they enjoying, the «brilliant results» of this specific «socialism». On the contrary, there is political and ideological chaos in Yugoslavia. A system which engenders large-scale unemployment at home and mass emigration of labour abroad prevails there, and this makes Yugoslavia completely dependent on the imperialist powers. The Yugoslav peoples are being exploited to the bone in the interests of the class in power and of all the imperialist powers which have made investments in that country.

The Yugoslav state is not concerned that prices go up every day, that the poverty of the

working masses is steadily increasing and that the country is not only up to its neck in debt, but is also deeply involved in the great crisis of the capitalist world. Yugoslavia has only limited independence and sovereignty, because, apart from anything else, it has no economic potential completely its own. The greater part of it exists in joint ownership with various foreign capitalist firms and states, therefore it is bound to suffer the destructive effects of the crisis and foreign exploitation.

But it is not accidental that world capitalism gives Yugoslav «self-administration» such great political and financial support and sings in harmony with the Titoite propaganda to pass this system off as «a new tested form of the construction of socialism» for all countries.

It does this because the form of Yugoslav «self-administration» provides a way of ideological and political subversion and sabotage against the revolutionary liberation movements of the proletariat and the peoples, a way to open the road to the political and economic penetration of imperialism into the various countries of the world. Imperialism and the bourgeoisie want to keep «self-administration» as a reserve system for various circumstances and different countries, in order to prolong the life of capitalism, which does not give up the ghost easily, but is striving to find various forms of government at the expense of the peoples.

The Yugoslav theories and practices of «non-

alignment» render a great service to various imperialists, for they help them hoodwink the peoples. This is in the interest of the imperialists and social-imperialists alike, because it helps them to establish and strengthen their influence in the «non-aligned countries», to divert the freedom-loving peoples from the road of national liberation and proletarian revolution. Therefore, both Carter and Brezhnev, as well as Hua Kuo-feng, lavish praise on the Titoite policy of «non-alignment» and try to exploit it for their own purposes.

Titoism has always been a weapon of the imperialist bourgeoisie, a fire-extinguisher to quell the flames of the revolution. It is of the same line and has the same aims as modern revisionism, in general, and its different variants, with which it is in ideological unity. The ways, forms and tactics they use in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism may be different, but their counterrevolutionary aims are identical.

In the efforts which the bourgeoisie and reaction are making to put down the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the peoples, **the revisionist parties of Europe, in the first place, and those of all countries on the other continents render them a great service.**

The revisionist parties of the countries of Western Europe are making efforts to concoct a theory about a «new society», allegedly socialist,

which will be achieved through «structural reforms» and in close coalition with the social-democratic parties, and even with the right-wing parties. This society, according to them, will be built on new foundations, through «social reforms», «social peace», «the parliamentary road» and the «historic compromise» with the bourgeois parties.

The revisionist parties of Europe, such as those of Italy, France and Spain, and following them, all the other revisionist parties of the West, deny Leninism, the class struggle, the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. All of them have embarked on the road of compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie. They have named this anti-Marxist line «Eurocommunism». «Eurocommunism» is a new pseudo-communist trend which is and is not in opposition to the Soviet revisionist bloc. This wavering stand is explained by their aim to have a coexistence of ideas with European social-democracy, and the whole welter of views seething in the cauldron of Europe. The «Eurocommunists» can unite with anybody at all except those who fight for the triumph of the revolution and the purity of the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

All the revisionist, opportunist and social-democratic trends are going the whole length to assist the superpowers in their diabolical activities to suppress the revolution and the peoples. The support of all these trends for the allegedly new organisms of the bourgeoisie has a single

aim: to smother the revolution by raising a thousand and one material, political and ideological obstacles to it. They are working to disorientate and split the proletariat and its allies, because they know that, divided and split by factional struggles, the latter will be unable to create, either at home or on an international plane, that ideological political and militant unity which is essential to cope with the attacks of world capitalism in decay.

The coalition of modern revisionism with social-democracy is afraid of the advent of fascism, especially in certain countries which are threatened by the extreme right. To avoid the fascist dictatorship, the revisionists and social-democrats make efforts «to mitigate» the contradictions and «tone down» the class struggle between the masses of the people and the proletariat, on the one hand, and the capitalist bourgeoisie, on the other. Thus, in order to secure «social peace», these subjects of the coalition have to make concessions to one another and to reach a compromise with the capitalist bourgeoisie, come to agreement with it over some sort of regime suitable to both sides. Thus, while the capitalist bourgeoisie and its parties openly continue their fight against communism, the revisionist parties endeavour to distort Marxism-Leninism, the guiding ideology of the revolution.

The trade-unions, which are reformist and are especially educated and trained in compromises with the owning class and only for economic claims

and not for strikes with political demands and aims of the seizure of state power by the proletariat, have become the mainstay of the revisionist parties of Europe. Naturally, their bargaining is aimed at striking a balance between the demand and the offer — one side begs alms and the other side determines the size of this alms. The two sides, both the reformist trade-unions and the revisionist parties, and the owning class with its parties, state power and trade-unions, are threatened by the revolution, by the proletariat and its genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. Therefore, they are in search of a reactionary compromise, a solution that cannot be the same in all the capitalist countries, because of the differences in the strength of capital, the depth of the crisis and the extent of the contradictions eroding them from within.

The Revolution — the Only Weapon to Defeat the Strategy of the Enemies of the Proletariat and the Peoples

All the enemies, the imperialists, social-imperialists and various revisionists, together or separately, are fighting to mislead progressive people, to discredit Marxism-Leninism, and especially to distort the Leninist theory of the revolution, to suppress the revolution and any kind of popular resistance and national liberation struggle.

The arsenal of the enemies of Marxism-

Leninism is large, but the forces of the revolution are also colossal. These are the forces which are stirring, clashing and fighting with the enemies of the revolution and which have ruined the peace of mind of the capitalist world and world reaction and are making life impossible for them.

> *«A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism. All the Powers of old Europe. . . have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre»*.*

This observation of Marx and Engels is still valid today. Imperialism, social-imperialism and modern revisionism think that the danger to them from communism has been eliminated, because, thinking that the heavy blow which the revolution has suffered from the revisionist betrayal is irreparable, they are underestimating the strength of Marxism-Leninism, and overestimating the material, suppressive military, and economic potential they have at their disposal. This is only an illusion of theirs.

The world proletariat is gathering its forces. From their own experience, the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples are gaining a clearer understanding, day by day, of the treachery of the Titoite, Khrushchevite, Chinese, «Eurocommun-

* K. Marx and F. Engels. «The Manifesto of the Communist Party», p. 13, Tirana, 1974 (Alb. ed.).

ist» and other modern revisionists. Time is working for the revolution, for socialism, and not for the bourgeoisie and imperialism, not for modern revisionism and world reaction. The fire of the revolution is burning everywhere in the hearts of the oppressed peoples who want to gain their genuine freedom, democracy and sovereignty, to take power into their own hands and to set out on the road of socialism, destroying imperialism and its flunkies.

That phenomenon of the time of Lenin, when the break-away from the Second International was followed by the creation of new Marxist-Leninist parties, is taking place today. The revisionist betrayal has brought about the setting up and strengthening of genuine communist parties, as it is bound to do, everywhere, and these parties have taken up and raised high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, which the revisionists have rejected and trampled in the mud. On them devolves the burden of opposing the glorious Leninist strategy of the revolution, the great theory of Marxism-Leninism to the global strategy of world imperialism and revisionism. On them devolves the burden of making the masses fully conscious of the objectives and the right road of the struggle and the sacrifices it demands, of uniting, organizing, guiding and leading them to victory.

We Marxist-Leninists, who are in the forefront of the titanic struggle which is being waged

today between the proletariat and the oppressed peoples who aspire to freedom, on the one hand, and the savage rapacious imperialists, on the other, must thoroughly understand the aims, tactics, methods and forms which the common enemies and the individual enemies of each country employ in the fight. We cannot see this thing properly if we do not base ourselves firmly on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution, if we do not see that in the present situation there are a series of weak links in the capitalist world chain, as there will be in the future, at which the revolutionaries and the peoples must carry out ceaseless activity, an unrelenting and courageous organized struggle to break these links one after another. This, of course, requires work, struggle, sacrifices and self-denial. Led by the interests of the revolution, the courageous peoples and individuals can and will face up to the large forces of imperialism, social-imperialism and reaction, which are linking up with one another, setting up new alliances and seeking a way out of the difficult situations created for them. It is the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists, the struggle of the peoples on all continents, in all countries, that create these difficult situations for the regressive forces.

The communists everywhere in the world nave no reason to fear the baseless myths which have predominated in revolutionary thought for some time. The communists must fight to win over

those who make mistakes, in order to help them mend their ways, making great efforts to this end without, of course, falling into opportunism themselves. In the process of the principled struggle, in the beginning there will be some vacillations but the vacillations will occur among the waverers, whereas amongst those who are resolute and apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly, who have a proper view of the interests of the proletariat of their own country, of the world proletariat and the revolution, there will be no vacillation. However, when the waverers see that the comrades are standing firm on their revolutionary Marxist-Leninist opinions, they will be further strengthened in their fight.

If the Marxist-Leninists apply the Marxist-Leninist theory correctly and with determination, on the basis of the present international conditions and the national conditions of each country, if they ceaselessly strengthen proletarian internationalist unity in merciless struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism of all trends, they will certainly overcome all the difficulties they will encounter on their road, however great they may be. Properly applied, Marxism-Leninism and its immortal principles will inevitably bring about the destruction of world capitalism and the triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by means of which the working class will build socialism and march towards communism.

II

THE LENINIST THEORY ON IMPERIALISM RETAINS ITS FULL VALIDITY

In the present conditions, when the Khrushchevite, Titoite, «Eurocommunist» and Chinese revisionists and the other anti-Marxist trends are attacking the cause of the revolution and peoples' liberation on the pretext that the situation has changed, a thorough study of Lenin's works on imperialism assumes first-rate importance.

We must return to these works and make an especially thorough and detailed study of Lenin's work of genius «Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism». From a careful study of this work, we shall see how the revisionists, and the Chinese leaders among them, distort the Leninist thought on imperialism, how they understand the aims, strategy and tactics of imperialism. Their writings, declarations, stands and actions show that their view of the nature of imperialism is completely wrong, they see it from counterrevolutionary and anti-Marxist positions, as did all the parties of the Second International and their ideologists, Kautsky and company, whom Lenin ruthlessly exposed.

If we study this work of Lenin's carefully and faithfully adhere to his analysis and conclusions of genius, we shall see that imperialism in our days fully retains those same characteristics that Lenin described, that the Leninist definition of our epoch as the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions remains unshaken, and that the triumph of the revolution is inevitable.

As is known, Lenin begins his analysis of imperialism with the **concentration of production and capital and the monopolies.** Today, too, the phenomena of the concentration and centralization of production and capital can be analysed correctly and scientifically only on the basis of the Leninist analysis of imperialism.

A characteristic of present-day capitalism is the ever increasing concentration of production and capital, which has led to the merging or absorption of small enterprises by the powerful ones. A consequence of this is the mass concentration of the work force in big trusts and concerns. These enterprises have also concentrated in their hands huge productive capacities and resources of energy and raw materials of incalculable proportions. At present the big capitalist enterprises are also utilizing nuclear energy and the newest technology, which belong to these enterprises exclusively.

Such gigantic organisms have a national and

an international character. Within their own country, they have ruined most of the small proprietors or industrialists, while on the international plane they have grown into colossal concerns, which include whole branches of the industry, agriculture, construction, transport, etc. of many countries. Wherever these concerns have extended their tentacles, wherever the concentration of production has been achieved by a tiny handful of multimillionaire capitalists, the tendency to the liquidation of the small owners and industrialists is becoming more widespread and pronounced. This has led to the further strengthening of monopolies.

> «*This transformation of competition into monopoly,*» said Lenin, «*is one of the most important phenomena, — if not the most important, in the economy of present-day capitalism. . .*»*.

Speaking of this feature of imperialism, he adds,

> «*...the rise of monopolies as the result of concentration of production in general is a universal and fundamental law of the present stage of development of capitalism*»*.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 237 (Alb. ed.).
* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 241 (Alb. ed.).

The development of capitalism in today's conditions fully confirms the above conclusion of Lenin's. Nowadays, the monopolies have become the most typical and common phenomenon, which determines the physiognomy of imperialism, its economic essence. In the imperialist countries, like the United States of America, the Federal German Republic, Britain, Japan, France, etc., the concentration of production has assumed unprecedented proportions.

For example, in 1976, there were nearly 17 million people, representing over 20 percent of the employed work force, employed in the 500 biggest US corporations. Sixty-six percent of all the goods sold came from these corporations. At the time when Lenin wrote his book «Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism», there was only one big American company in the capitalist world, the «United States Steel Corporation» with share capital of over one billion dollars, whereas in 1976 the number of billionaire companies was about 350. In 1975, the «General Motors Corporation» automobile trust, this supermonopoly, had a total capital in excess of 22 billion dollars and exploited an army of nearly 800,000 workers. Next comes the monopoly «Standard Oil of New Jersey», which dominates the oil industry of the United States of America and other countries and which exploits over 700,000 workers. In the automobile industry there are three big monopolies

which account for more than 90 percent of production in this branch; in both the aviation and the steel industries, four very big companies account for 65 and 47 percent of production respectively.

The same process has occurred and is occurring in the other imperialist countries, too. In the Federal German Republic, 13 percent of the total number of enterprises have concentrated about 50 percent of the production and 40 percent of the labour power of the country. In Britain, 50 big monopolies dominate everything. The British Steel Corporation accounts for over 90 percent of the steel production of the country. In France, two companies have concentrated three fourths of the steel production in their hands, four monopolies own the whole production of automobiles, whereas four others control the entire output of oil products. In Japan, ten big black metallurgy companies produce all the pig iron and over three fourths of the steel, while eight companies operate in non-ferrous metallurgy. The same applies to the other branches and sectors[1].

The small and middle-sized enterprises which still exist in these countries are directly dependent on monopolies. They receive orders from the mo-

1 Information from: «Monthly Bulletin of Statistics», United Nations, 1977; «Statistical Yearbook» 1976; the US journal «Fortune», 1976, etc.

nopolies and work for them; get credits and raw materials, technology, etc. from them. In practice, they have become appendages of the monopolies.

The concentration and centralization of production and capital, creating giant monopolies which have no technological unity, is widespread today. Enterprises and entire branches of industrial production, construction, transport, trade, services, of the infrastructure, etc., operate within these gigantic «conglomerate» monopolies. They turn out everything, from children's toys to intercontinental missiles.

The economic power of the monopolies and the concentration of capital, which has increased and is constantly increasing, creates a situation in which the victims of the competition are not just «the small babies», that is, the unmonopolized enterprises, which were typical in the past, but even big financial enterprises and groups. As a result of the insatiable appetite of the monopolies for high monopoly profits and the extreme sharpening of the competition, this process has assumed colossal proportions during the last two decades. The mergers and take-overs in the capitalist world today are 7 to 10 times greater than in the years prior to the Second World War.

The mergers and combinations of industrial, trading, farming and banking enterprises have led to the creation of new forms of monopolies, to the

creation of big industrial-commercial or industrial-agrarian corporations, forms which are finding wide application not only in the capitalist countries of the West, but also in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other revisionist countries. In the past the monopoly combines carried on the transport and selling of goods with the help of other independent firms, whereas today, the monopolies control production, transport and marketing.

The monopolies not only try to eliminate competition between the enterprises under their control, but have also extended their clutches to monopolize all the resources of raw materials, all the regions rich in important minerals, like iron, coal, copper, uranium, etc. This process is going on on the national and the international plane.

The concentration of production and capital assumed colossal proportions especially after the Second World War, with the expansion and development of the sector of state monopoly capitalism.

State monopoly capitalism means the subordination of the state apparatus to monopolies, the establishment of their complete domination in the economic, political and social life of the country. In this way the state intervenes directly in the economy in the interest of the financial oligarchy, in order to ensure the maximum profit for the class in power through the exploitation of all the

working people, as well as to strangle the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles.

State monopoly property, as the most characteristic basic element of state monopoly capitalism, does not represent the property of one individual capitalist or group of capitalists, but the property of the capitalist state, the property of the bourgeois class in power. In various imperialist countries the state monopoly capitalist sector accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the total production.

State monopoly capitalism, which represents the highest stage of concentration of production and capital, is the main form of property prevailing today in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. This state monopoly capitalism is in the service of the new bourgeois class in power.

In China, too, through a number of reforms, such as the establishment of profit as the main aim of the activity of the enterprises, the application of capitalist practices in organization, management and remuneration, the creation of economic regions, trusts and combines very similar to the Soviet, Yugoslav and Japanese ones, the opening of doors to foreign capital, the direct links of enterprises with foreign monopolies, etc., the economy is assuming forms typical of state monopoly capitalism.

At present, in the capitalist and revisionist world the concentration and centralization of pro-

duction and capital have reached an inter-state level. The European Common Market, Comecon, etc., which represent the union of monopolies of various imperialist powers, also encourage and realize this tendency in practice.

Analysing the forms of international monopolies, in his time Lenin spoke of the cartels and syndicates. In today's conditions, when the concentration of production and capital has reached very large proportions, the monopoly bourgeoisie has also found other forms for the exploitation of working people. These are the multinational companies.

In their outward appearance, these companies seek to give the impression that they are under the joint ownership of capitalists of many countries. In fact, in regard to their capital and control, the multinational companies belong mainly to one country, although they carry out their activities in many countries. They are expanding more and more through the absorption of local companies and firms, big and small, which cannot cope with the savage competition.

The multinational companies open up subsidiaries and extend their enterprises to those countries where the prospects for maximum profits seem most secure. The US multinational company «Ford», for example, has set up 20 big plants in other countries, in which 100 thousand workers of various nationalities are employed.

Between the multinational companies and the bourgeois state there are close links and reciprocal dependence, which are based on their exploiting class character. The capitalist state is used as a tool in their service for their aims of domination and expansion on both the national and the international plane.

In regard to their major economic role and the great weight they carry in the whole life of the country, some multinational companies, individually, constitute a mighty economic force which, in many instances, is equal to, or even exceeds, the budgets or production of several developed capitalist countries taken together. The production of one of the powerful multinational companies of the United States of America, «General Motors Corporation», is greater than the industrial production of Holland, Belgium and Switzerland taken together. They intervene to secure special favours and privileges for themselves in the countries in which they operate. For example, in 1975, the owners of the electronics industry of the United States of America demanded that the Mexican Government change its Labour Code which envisaged some safety measures, or otherwise they would transfer their industry to Costa-Rica, and, in order to bring pressure to bear, closed down many factories in which nearly 12,000 Mexican workers were employed.

The multinational companies are levers of im-

perialism and one of the main forms of its expansion. They are pillars of neo-colonialism and affect the national sovereignty and independence of the countries in which they operate. In order to open the way to their domination, these companies do not hesitate to commit any crime, from the organization of plots and the dislocation of the economy, down to the outright buying of top officials, political and trade-union leaders, etc. The Lockheed scandal provided ample proof of this.

Many multinational companies have established themselves and are operating in the revisionist countries, too[1]. They have begun to penetrate China, too.

The concentration and centralization of production and capital, which characterize the capitalist world today and have led to extensive socialization of production, have not in any way altered the exploiting nature of imperialism. On the contrary, they have increased and intensified the oppression and impoverishment of the working people. These phenomena prove to the hilt Lenin's

1 Seventeen US, 18 Japanese, 13 West-German, 20 French, and 7 Italian and other multinational companies have established themselves in the Soviet Union or have opened offices there. Over 30 multinational companies have established themselves in Poland. Of them, 10 are American, 6 West-German, 6 British, 3 Japanese, etc. There are 32 such companies operating in Rumania, 31 in Hungary, 30 in Czechoslovakia. The picture is the same in the other revisionist countries. (Information from the book «Vodka-Cola», by Karl Levinson, 1977, pp. 79-82).

thesis that under conditions of the concentration of production and capital in imperialism,

> *«the result is immense progress in the socialization of production,»* but, nevertheless, *«. . .appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few»**.

The monopolies and multinational companies remain great enemies of the proletariat and the peoples.

The intensification of the process of concentration of production and capital which is taking place in our time, has further exacerbated the basic contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation, along with all the other contradictions. Today, just as in the past, the colossal income and superprofits realized from the savage exploitation of workers are appropriated by a handful of capitalist magnates. Likewise, the means of production, with which the united branches of industry have been equipped, are the private property of capitalists, while the working class remains enslaved to the owners of the means of production and its labour power remains a mar-

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 247 (Alb. ed.).

ket commodity. Nowadays the big capitalist enterprises no longer exploit tens or hundreds of workers but hundreds of thousands of them. As a result of the ruthless capitalist exploitation of this great army of workers, the surplus value seized by the US corporations in 1976 alone, is estimated at over 100 billion dollars, as against 44 billion in 1960.

Lenin exposed the opportunists of the Second International, who preached the possibility of liquidating the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism as a result of the emergence and development of monopolies. He proved with scientific argument that the monopolies, as vehicles of the oppression and exploitation of labour and the private appropriation of the results of labour, make the contradictions of capitalism even more severe. The superstructure of the capitalist order is built on the basis of the domination of monopolies. This superstructure defends and represents the predatory interests of the monopolies, on both the national and international plane. The monopolies dictate the internal and external policy, the economic, social, military, and other policies.

The present-day reality of the concentration of production and capital also exposes the preachings of the reactionary chiefs of social-democracy, the modern revisionists and opportunists of every hue, that the trusts, the property of state monopoly capitalism, etc., can allegedly be transformed

in a peaceful way into socialist economies, that allegedly present-day monopoly capitalism will be integrated gradually into socialism.

The concentration of production and capital, Lenin teaches us, also serve as a basis for increased concentration of money capital, its concentration in the hands of big banks, and the birth and development of finance capital. In the course of the development of capitalism, together with the monopolies, the banks, too, assume great development, absorbing the money capital of the monopolies and concerns as well as of small producers and investors. In this way, the banks, which are in the hands of the capitalists and serve them, become the owners of the main financial means.

The same process, which was carried out for the elimination of the small enterprises by the big ones, by the cartels and monopolies, has also taken place in the liquidation, one after the other, of small banks. Thus, just as the big enterprises created the monopolies, the big banks, too, created their banking concerns. In the last two decades this phenomenon has assumed colossal proportions and it is still going on, very rapidly, today. A distinctive feature of today's mergers and take-overs is the fact that not only the small banks but also the middle-sized and the relatively big ones are involved. This phenomenon is accounted for by the increasing severity of the contradictions of cap-

italist reproduction, the extension of the struggle of competition and the grave crisis of the financial and monetary system of the capitalist world.

Twenty-six big financial groups dominate in the United States of America. The biggest of them is the Morgan group, with 20 big banks, insurance companies, etc., and with share capital of 90 billion dollars.

The level of the concentration and centralization of banking capital is also very high in the other main capitalist countries. In West Germany, three out of seventy big banks own over 58 percent of all banking assets. In Britain, all banking activity is controlled by four banks known as the «Big Four». The level of concentration of banking capital is also high in Japan and France, too.

Lenin has proved that banking capital is interlocked with industrial capital. At first, the banks are interested in the fate of the credits they advance to the industrialists. They mediate to ensure that the industrialists who receive the credits reach agreement among themselves to avoid competition with one another because the banks, themselves, would also suffer from this. This was the first step of the banks in their interlocking with industrial capital. With the development of the concentration of production and money capital, the banks become direct investors in the production enterprises, setting up joint-stock companies. In this way, banking capital penetrates in-

to industry, construction, agriculture, transport, the sphere of circulation and all other fields. For their part, the enterprises buy large holdings of shares and become participants in banks. Today the directors of banks and monopoly enterprises are members of one another's boards of management, thus creating what Lenin called their «personal union». The finance capital which emerges from this process includes all forms of capital: industrial capital, money capital and commodity capital. Characterizing this process, Lenin said:

> *«The concentration of production; the monopolies arising therefrom; the merging or coalescence of banks with industry — such is the history of the rise of finance capital and such is the content of that concept»**.

Although since the Second World War finance capital has increased and undergone structural changes, it still has precisely those same aims it has always had, the making of maximum profits through the exploitation of the broad masses of working people inside and outside the country. The insurance companies, which have greatly increased over recent years in the main capitalist countries and have become competitors of the banks, have the same role. In the United States

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 273 (Alb. ed.).

of America, for example, in 1970 as against 1950, banking assets had increased 3.5 fold, whereas those of insurance companies had increased 6.5 fold, over the same period.

With the capital they accumulate through plundering the people, these companies have been able to advance the monopolies large sums amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. In this way, the insurance companies are merged and interlocked with the industrial and banking monopolies, becoming an organic constituent part of finance capital.

Driven by its insatiable thirst for profits, the monopoly bourgeoisie turns every source of temporarily available monetary means, such as the workers' pension funds, the people's savings, etc., into capital.

Concentrated finance capital draws exceptionally large amounts of income not only from the profit accruing to it from the money absorbed from the concerns, small industrialists, etc., etc., but also from the issue of securities and provision of loans. Just as in the case of savings' deposits, in the latter, too, only a small share of the profit goes to the lenders, while the bank itself makes colossal profits from these activities, through which it increases its own capital and investments, which, of course, create a continuous flow of additional profits for finance capital. Finance capital invests mostly in industry, but it has extended its

network of speculation to other assets, too, such as land, railways, and other branches and sectors.

The banks have real possibilities of providing considerable sums in credits, which are required by the high level of concentration of production and the domination of monopolies. In this manner, favourable conditions are created for the big monopoly combines to step up their savage exploitation of the working masses both at home and abroad, in order to ensure maximum profits.

With the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, the banks there assumed all the features characteristic of monopolies. In these countries, the banks serve the exploitation of the broad masses of the working people, both at home and abroad, in the same way as in all other capitalist countries.

In recent years, trade on time payment under which customers buy consumer goods, especially durable consumer items, has increased rapidly in the capitalist and revisionist countries. The provision of such credits ensures the bourgeoisie markets for the sale of goods, the capitalists make colossal profits from the high interest rates charged, while the debtors are bound hand and foot to the creditors and the capitalist firms.

The debts and other obligations of the working people to the banks and money-lending institutions have greatly increased at the present time. In the United States of America alone, in

1976 the indebtedness of the population from such credits had reached the sum of 167 billion dollars, as against 6 billion in 1945, while in the Federal German Republic the indebtedness of the population had amounted to more than 46 billion marks.

The increased concentration and centralization of banking capital has led to increased economic and political domination by the financial oligarchy and the use of a series of forms and methods to increase the economic bondage, the impoverishment and misery of the broad masses of working people.

The development of finance capital enabled a small group of powerful industrial capitalists and bankers not only to accumulate great wealth, but also to concentrate real economic and political power, which makes itself felt in the entire life of the country, in their hands. These all-powerful people are those who head the monopolies and banks and constitute what is called the financial oligarchy. Proceeding from the fact that the large companies have now been transformd into shareholders' companies, in which even some worker may have a few token shares, the apologists of capitalism labour to prove that capital has now allegedly lost the private character which it had in the time when Marx wrote «Capital», or when Lenin analysed imperialism, that it has supposedly become people's capital. But this is a fable. Today, as in the past, powerful private industrial-

financial groups dominate the imperialist countries: the Rockefellers, Morgans, Duponts, Mellons, Fords, the Chicago, Texas, California and other groups in the United States of America; the financial groups of the Rothschilds, Behrings, Samuels, etc., in Britain; Krupp, Siemens, Mannesmann, Thyssen, Gerling, etc., in West Germany; Fiat, Alfa-Romeo, Montedison, Olivetti, etc., in Italy; the great families in France, and so on.

As the possessor of industrial and finance capital, the financial oligarchy has established its economic and political domination over the entire life of the country. It has even subordinated the state apparatus, which has been transformed into a tool in the hands of the financial plutocracy, to its own interests. The financial oligarchy dismisses and appoints governments, dictates the internal and foreign policy. In internal life, it is linked with the reactionary forces, with all those political, ideological, educational, and cultural institutions which defend its political and economic power, while in foreign policy it defends and backs up all the conservative and reactionary forces which support and open the road for its monopoly expansion, and fight for the preservation and consolidation of capitalism.

The financial oligarchy does not hesitate to use any means to secure its own domination, establishing political reaction in all fields.

«. . .finance capital,» said Lenin, *«strives for domination, not for freedom»*.*

The situation today proves that oppression by the monopoly bourgeoisie has been intensified everywhere. On this basis, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is becoming deeper. At the same time, the economic and financial expansion, accompanied with political and military expansion, has further exacerbated the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, as well as the contradictions among the imperialist powers themselves. The present-day propaganda of the Chinese revisionists ignores this undeniable objective reality.

The concentration and centralization of banking capital now takes place, not just in the context of one country, but in the context of several capitalist, or capitalist and revisionist countries. The joint banks of the European Common Market, or the «International Bank for Economic Co-operation», as well as the «Investment Bank» of Comecon, are of this character. Similarly, the combinations of the West-German-Polish or the Anglo-Rumanian, Franco-Rumanian or Anglo-Hungarian banks, or the American-Yugoslav, Anglo-Yugoslav or other banking corporations are banking unions of the capitalist type. The Soviet Union

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 23, p. 124 (Alb. ed.).

has opened up many banks in a number of capitalist countries and these have become competitors and partners of capitalist banks wherever they have been established, in Zurich, London, Paris, Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere.

China, too, is being sucked deeper and deeper into the whirlpool of this process of the capitalist integration of banks. Apart from the banks it has in Hong-Kong, Macao and Singapore, tomorrow China will be setting up banks in Japan, America, and elsewhere. At the same time, it is permitting the banks of imperialist powers to penetrate China.

Lenin emphasized that present-day capitalism is characterized by the export of capital. Today this economic feature of imperialism has been further developed and strengthened. The biggest exporters of capital in the world today are the United States of America, Japan, the Soviet Union, the Federal German Republic, Britain and France.

For a certain period, capital was exported by the United States of America, Britain, France and Germany, countries with developed industry, which sucked from colonies the riches of the land and those that lay below its surface. Later, as a consequence of the war and crises, some imperialist powers such as Britain, France, Germany, were weakened economically, while American

imperialism enriched itself and became a superpower. In the situation created after the Second World War the torrent of exports of American capital was very detrimental to the other capitalist powers.

Today, American capital is exported to all countries, even to the industrialized ones, in the form of investments, credits, loans, in the form of co-operation in joint companies or through the setting up of large industrial companies. American imperialism, monopoly capital, invests in the undeveloped and poor countries, because there production costs are low, while the level of exploitation of working people is high. It invests in order to secure raw materials, to monopolize markets, to sell its industrial products.

It is known that the development of capitalist countries takes place unevenly, therefore the big monopolies and companies of the United States of America and the other countries export capital precisely to those countries in which economic development requires investments and technology.

The capital invested brings fabulous profits to the financial concerns and monopolies, because in the poor, undeveloped countries, land is very cheap and large tracts of it, together with its riches, can be purchased with little money. Labour power is cheap, too, because people on the verge of starvation are forced to work for very low pay. It has been calculated that for every dollar invest-

ed in these countries, the imperialist powers make a profit of 5 dollars.

According to American official data, during the 1971-1975 period alone, direct investments from the United States of America in the new states totalled 6.5 billion dollars, while the profits it made in these countries over the same period amounted to nearly 30 billion dollars[1].

In order to disguise the export of capital, the imperialist powers also resort to the practice of according credits. Through these so-called credits or aid, the big capitalist concerns and the states to which they belong bring great pressure to bear on the recipient states and peoples, and keep them under control. The «aid» or credits to the undeveloped countries originate from the plunder of the wealth of these countries as well as from the exploitation of the working masses of the developed countries and are given to the wealthy of the undeveloped countries. In other words, this means that the big US monopolies, for example, fatten on the sweat of both the American people and the other peoples, and when they export capital and accord credits, these represent, precisely, the sweat and blood of these peoples. On the other hand, these credits, which the big monopolies provide for the countries of the so-called third

1 The American review «Survey of Business», p. 44, August 1976.

world, in fact, serve the feudal-bourgeois classes which rule these countries.

The credits the new states receive are links of the imperialist chain around the necks of their own peoples. As the statistical data show, the debts of these countries double every five years. From nearly 8.5 billion dollars in 1955, the debts of the undeveloped countries to the imperialist powers had risen to over 150 billion dollars in 1977.

World capitalism has developed technology and expertise in its own interests, in order to multiply its profits from the discovery of underground resources, the intensification of agriculture, etc. All this technology, the technical-scientific revolution itself, and the new methods of economic exploitation serve imperialism, the capitalist monopolies, but not the peoples. Capitalism never makes investments, provides loans, or exports capital to other countries without first calculating the profits it will realize for itself. The big monopolies and banks, which have spread their spider's web all over the capitalist and revisionist world, never accord credits unless they are presented with concrete data about the income to be made from the exploitation of a mine, the land, the extraction of oil or water from a desert, etc.

There are also other forms of according credits, like those practised with those pseudo-socialist states which are trying to disguise the capitalist course on which they are proceeding. These are

large credits provided in the form of trade credits which, of course, must be repaid within a short time. These are provided jointly by many capitalist countries, which have calculated in advance the economic as well as political profits they will draw from the recipient state, taking into account both its economic potential and ability to pay. In no case do the capitalists provide their credits for the construction of socialism. They provide them to destroy socialism. Therefore, a genuine socialist country never accepts credits, in any form, from a capitalist, bourgeois, or revisionist country.

Like the Khrushchevite Soviet revisionists, the Chinese revisionists, also, employ many slogans, many quotations, build many phrases which sound «Leninist», «revolutionary», but their real activity is reactionary, counterrevolutionary. The Chinese leaders try to present even their opportunist stands towards, and relations with, the imperialist countries as if they are in the interest of socialism. These revisionists use this camouflage with the intention of keeping the masses of the proletariat and the people in the dark, so that they will not be able to transform their discontent into a powerful means to carry out the revolution.

Let us take, for example, the question of the economic construction of the country, the development of the socialist economy relying on one's own forces. This principle is correct. Every inde-

pendent, sovereign socialist state must mobilize the entire people, and define its economic policy correctly, must take all measures for the proper and most rational exploitation of all the wealth of the country, and administer this wealth thriftily, must increase it in the interest of its own people and must not allow it to be plundered by others. This is a main, basic orientation for every socialist country, while aid from abroad, aid from other socialist countries, is supplementary.

The credits two socialist countries accord each other have quite a different character. These credits constitute disinterested internationalist aid. Internationalist aid never engenders capitalism, never impoverishes the masses of the people, on the contrary, it helps develop industry and agriculture, serves their harmonization, leads to the improvement of the well-being of the working masses, to the strengthening of socialism.

In the first place, the economically developed socialist states ought to assist the other socialist countries. This does not mean that a socialist country should not develop relations also with the other non-socialist countries. But these must be economic relations on the bases of mutual interest and must not in any way make the economy of a socialist, or any other non-socialist country, dependent on the more powerful countries. If these relations among states are based on the exploitation of small, economically weak states by

big and powerful states, then such «aid» must be rejected, for it is enslaving.

Lenin says that finance capital has cast, in the literal meaning of the word, its nets over all the countries of the world. The capitalists' monopolies, cartels and syndicates work systematically, first they seize the internal market of their own country, get industry, agriculture, under their control, enslave the working class and other working people, make superprofits, and then create great possibilities to monopolize markets all over the world. Finance capital plays a direct role in this.

We see today, and this completely tallies with Lenin's teachings on imperialism as the final stage of capitalism, that the two superpowers, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, are contending over the division of the world, to capture markets. The problem of oil, for instance, which has become acute throughout the world, is, first of all, the domain of the big American monopoly companies, but British, Dutch, and other oil companies are also involved in them. The Americans are manoeuvring on the problem of oil in order to have a complete monopoly of it. They have invested big capital and established large-scale equipment in the oil producing countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, etc., and have got the ruling cliques of these countries into their clutches, by corrupting kings, sheiks, and imams with large sums of dollars. The rulers of the oil producing

countries are allowed by the financial plutocracy of these countries to invest in the United States of America, Britain and elsewhere, even to buy shares in various monopoly companies, as well as luxury hotels, factories, etc.

Saudi Arabia, for instance, is a semi-feudal country where poverty and obscurantism reign, although it extracts 420 million tons of oil a year. While the working masses live in poverty, the king and the big landowner class have deposited over 40 billion dollars in the Wall Street banks alone. The situation is the same in Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, and elsewhere. These cliques make all sorts of concessions to the imperialist powers to plunder the assets of the peoples of the countries where they rule, with the aim of getting a share of the profits for themselves.

The investments made by the oil producing countries, and which are the property of the ruling cliques, constitute a union, of course, on a very small scale, of the capital of these cliques with American or British capital. On the face of it, it seems as if the ruling cliques of the oil producing countries have a sort of partnership of investments with American, British, or French imperialism, and allegedly influence the economies of the latter. In reality, quite the opposite is the case. The profits of American imperialists and the other imperialists are enormously big in comparison with the profits allocated to these cliques. This is

a characteristic of present-day neo-colonialism, which, in order to be able to exploit the riches of some countries to the maximum, makes some cautious concessions in favour of the bourgeois-capitalist, or feudal ruling groups, of course, not to its own detriment. This example confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis, that the interests of the bourgeoisie of various countries can very easily become interlocked, just as the interests of private monopolies can be interlocked with those of state monopolies. The big monopolies may also combine with the monopolies which are less powerful but which control great assets, especially underground resources, such as iron, chromium, copper, uranium, and other mines.

Government loans, credits and aid have become one of the most widespread forms of the export of capital today. This kind of export is practised by the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries, in particular.

Apart from the extraction of capitalist profits, these credits, this «aid» and loans also have political objectives. The states which accord the credits aim to support and consolidate the political and economic power of particular cliques, which defend the economic, political and military interests of the creditor country. As the agreements on such credits are concluded between governments, they make the economic and political

dependence of the debtor on the creditor even greater. A classical example of this form of capital export is the «Marshall Plan», which, after the Second World War, became the economic basis for the political and military expansion of the United States of America in the countries of Western Europe. The so-called aid which the Soviet revisionists provide allegedly for the development of the economy and the setting up of the state sector of industry in such countries as India, Iraq, and elsewhere, is of the same nature.

At present, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and the capitalism of the industrialized countries have reached such a stage of development that the profit they realize from the accumulation of capital has grown extremely. The accumulation of capital creates large profits, which go into the pockets of the monopolists, the financial oligarchy, who do not put this income at the service of the poverty-stricken working people, but export it to those countries from which other, greater profits may accrue to them. These are the countries which China calls the «third world». However, they make investments of this kind in the developed capitalist countries, too.

Many books have been written about the process of penetration of American capital into Europe and its political and economic aims. A clear picture of this is given in the book by the American author Geoffrey Owen. At the begin-

ning of the chapter «The International Companies», he says that the development of American investments abroad has been made according to the concept that the American firms represent not companies with overseas interests, but international companies. The headquarters of these companies are in the United States of America. This means that the various big American firms think not only of covering their own country and the needs of industry and clients within the United States of America, but also of extending their networks to foreign countries. These companies invest their «excess capital» in other countries in order to make bigger profits. Such giant corporations as «Socony Mobil», «Standard Oil of New Jersey», etc., make nearly half their profits from the plunder and exploitation of foreign countries. About 500 companies secure profits of about 10 billion dollars outside the country every year. There are more than 3,000 such enterprises with investments in foreign countries. This is how such formulas and terms as «multinational companies», or «international capitalism», etc., have come into daily use in journalism and banking operations.

Geoffrey Owen says that in 1929 over 1,300 European companies were owned or controlled by American firms. This was the first stage of the American offensive on European industry. The pressure of the Second World War, which was

being prepared, temporarily halted the invasion of American capital. From 1929 up till 1946, the amount of direct investments by American companies in other countries of the world fell from 7,500 million to 7,200 million dollars. However, after the Second World War, in 1950, the amount of American investments abroad had risen to 11,200 million, half of it concentrated in the Latin-American countries and Canada. The investments in Latin America were made to exploit the raw materials: oil, copper, iron ore, bauxites, as well as bananas and other agricultural products. In Canada they were mainly in mining and oil and developed on a wide scale because of its proximity and other conditions facilitating penetration.

The Europe of the 1950's also became another important target for American investments. Investments on this continent were extended rapidly in communications, mass production goods and complex equipment. Together with investments, American goods and products poured in.

The author in question points out that the situation created after the Second World War in the capitalist market gave an even greater impulse to American investments. Here are the figures on the increase of these investments abroad: in 1946 they totalled 7,200 million and then they began to rise to 11,200 million in 1950, 44,300

million in 1964 and over 60,000 million dollars in 1977.

By incessantly extending their operations on a world-wide scale, the American companies have made the competition with the local firms much fiercer and increased the fear of domination by the American giants. This problem is even more acute in the undeveloped countries where the American firms dominate the key branches of industry and exercise a preponderant influence in the national economy of these countries. In other words, these giant American companies control the local economies and governments and in fact they run them.

The prolonged struggle which went on between the American oil companies and the Mexican Government and which ended in 1938 with the collapse of the Mexican Government's policy of opposition, is well known. There was a similar outcome to the struggle between the British oil monopoly and the Iranian Government, which resulted in the toppling of Mossadeq. Such ruinous conflicts are going on all the time and they end with the triumph of the big American trusts.

The big oil companies operate world-wide. For them it has become normal and necessary to completely control all the capital and production of this branch, to control governments, etc., in

the countries where they have invested, because, if they lacked these possibilities, then difficulties would arise in the co-ordination of their activity on a world scale. This is why the big foreign companies oppose the efforts of the local capitalists to get a bigger share in the profits than that the American investors or those of other imperialist countries allow them.

The American companies in Europe, Canada, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere, have created such a situation that in practice they control the economies of many countries. The governments of these countries stand in great fear of the United States of America, which has made itself the *leadership** of the European economy, just as it has done in military matters. Therefore, the industrialized capitalist countries of Europe try to hinder the invasion of American capital which has been and is pouring in ever greater amounts into them.

The Chinese leadership claims that the European states, industrialized since the 19th century, are making more investments in the United States of America. But it is known that while the investments of European capital in the United States are made mainly in the form of securities, shares, bonds, deposits, etc., the American investments in Europe have dominant po-

* English in the original.

sitions in the most important branches of the European economy.

Endeavouring to justify the increase of American investments, Geoffrey Owen claims that the European countries want and are making efforts to develop their industries on scientific bases, as, for instance, the electronics and computer industries. These industries countribute to a certain extent to the technical progress, the rise of exports and the overall economic growth of these countries. But the American companies are more advanced in this field than their European rivals and they control this technical progress in their own interests.

In computer manufacturing, for instance, the respective European companies have established close links to protect themselves against competition from the American «International Business Machine» (IBM) corporation which controls more than 70 percent of the American market and an even greater proportion of the world market.

Likewise, the big American companies have the tendency to embark on joint ventures with the local enterprises. In order to camouflage their exploitation, many firms avoid having one hundred per cent ownership of subsidiaries, and set up companies on a 49-51 percent or 50-50 joint investment basis. That is how the Americans have gone about it in Japan, and that is how they have gone about it in Yugoslavia, too, which tries to

create the impression that it is building socialism, relying on its own forces, whereas in reality the Titoites have divided Yugoslavia economically among the United States of America and the big firms of the developed industrial countries. By doing so, the Titoites have also restricted the freedom and independence of Yugoslavia.

There is a tendency among many of these big American companies, like «General Motors», «Ford», «Chrysler», « General Electric», etc., to have, in fact, 100 percent ownership of their subsidiaries in foreign countries. However, these subsidiaries, according to Owen, never forget the problem of nationalization, and their answer to this is that «it is not a question of setting up companies with local investors, but of encouraging international ownership of the shares in the mother companies». This is the concept of the «international» of capitalism, of which «General Motors», in particular, is the ardent champion.

These orientations of imperialist American capital or of the American industrial establishment which invests outside the United States of America in order to create its colonies and empire, are just a few facts which clearly illustrate the thesis that US imperialism has not been weakened in the least, despite what the Chinese revisionists pretend. On the contrary, it has grown stronger, has gained large concessions in foreign countries and is running many important branches of their

economy. It has also caused the governments of other countries innumerable difficulties, frequently makes the law in these countries, and has many governments under its control and direction. Of course, this process has its ups and downs, but the general trend does not indicate the weakening of US imperialism.

We are now living at a time when another superpower, Soviet social-imperialism, is exporting its capital and is bent on exploiting the different peoples. The capital exported by this superpower results from the surplus value realized in the Soviet Union, which has been transformed into a capitalist country.

The restoration of capitalism has led to a polarization of the present-day Soviet society, in which a small section rules and exploits the overwhelming majority of the people. Now, the stratum consisting of the bureaucrats, the technocrats and the upper creative intelligentsia has been created and assumed the form of a separate bourgeois, exploiting class which appropriates and divides up the surplus value extracted from the savage exploitation of the working class and the broad working masses. Unlike the countries of classical capitalism, where this surplus value is appropriated in proportion to the amount of capital of each capitalist, in the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries it is distributed according to the position people of the higher bourgeois stra-

tum occupy in the state, economic, scientific, and cultural hierarchy, etc. The high salaries, routine and special bonuses, prizes and stimuli, privileges, etc., have been built up into a whole institution for the appropriation of the surplus value extracted from the toil and sweat of the working people. The stratum which represents the «collective capitalist» protects this plunder through a host of laws and norms, which guarantee the capitalist oppression and exploitation.

The Soviet economy has now become integrated into the system of world capitalism. While American, German, Japanese and other capital has penetrated deeply into the Soviet Union, Soviet capital is being exported to other countries and, in various forms, is merging with local capital.

It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union economically exploits the satellite countries, in the first place. But now it is competing and contesting with the other capitalist states for markets, spheres of investment, for the plunder of raw materials, the preservation of neo-colonialist laws in world trade, etc.

Bent on extending its hegemony, the new Soviet bourgeoisie exports capital, but here it comes up against competition not only from US imperialism, which is very powerful, but also from the other developed capitalist states, such as Japan, Britain, West Germany, France, etc. In their quest

for superprofits, these states export capital not only to Africa, Asia and Latin America, but also to the East European countries which are under the tutelage of the revisionist Soviet Union, and export capital even to the Soviet Union itself.

The ruling cliques of the so-called socialist countries, like the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., and now China, too, allow foreign capital to flow into their countries, because this capital serves the ruling cliques, while it is a heavy burden on the peoples. The Comecon countries are up to their necks in debt. They are in debt to the Western countries to the tune of 50 billion dollars.

Yugoslavia was one of the first revisionist countries to allow the penetration of foreign capital into its economy. First it received credits, then bought licences, and later went over to setting up joint enterprises. In Yugoslavia a law was adopted in 1967, which permitted the creation of joint enterprises, in which 49 percent of capital was owned by foreign companies. In 1977, there were 170 such enterprises in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia has ensured the most favourable conditions for the capitalist firms to carry out their activity and ensure maximum profits.

The Yugoslav phenomenon proves that the foreign capital invested in Yugoslavia is one of the decisive factors which has turned it into a capitalist country. The United States of America and

the other wealthy capitalist states have lost nothing by these investments. On the contrary, they have made huge profits, while increasing the misery of the working class and the peasantry of Yugoslavia. Lenin said that the exporting of capital is a solid basis for the exploitation of the majority of the nations and countries of the world, for the capitalist parasitism of a handful of very rich states.

The capitalist states will make huge profits in China, too. We see that US, Japanese, West-German and other capital is now pouring in there in billions of dollars. Agreements have been signed with the Japanese for the joint exploitation of oil fields and the power resources of the Yangtze River. An agreement has been concluded with the Germans for the building of coal mines, etc. The investments which are being and will be made in China will certainly bring the foreign capitalists handsome profits, but at the same time they will strengthen the bases of capitalism in China.

The exporting of capital from one capitalist country to another capitalist or revisionist country, no matter whether the state which gives or receives it is big or small, is always one of the forms of exploitation of the peoples by capital. This exploitation brings about the economic and political dependence of the recipient country.

Lenin pointed out that, **after capturing the home market, the monopolies engage in economic**

struggle to redivide and capture the world market for industrialized goods and raw materials. Competition and their greed for profits impel the monopolists of different countries to reach temporary agreements, to enter into alliances and combinations with one another in order to divide the international markets for the sale of finished goods and the purchase of raw materials. Even when they possess reserves of raw materials and energy, the developed capitalist states turn their attack on other countries, since production costs in these countries are lower than in their own countries and workers' wages, especially, are several times lower.

The struggle that has been waged and is still going on to capture oil resources and markets is notorious. As a result of this struggle scores and hundreds of private enterprises and companies have been ruined and the international oil cartel, which comprises 7 big monopolies (5 American, 1 British and 1 British-Dutch, the notorious Esso, Texaco, Shell, etc.), have managed to gain control over 60 percent of the oil extraction and oil sales in the capitalist countries of the Western world, and about 54 percent of its processing.

A similar division of resources and markets exists today for copper and tin minerals, for uranium and other valuable strategic minerals.

Many of the old colonialist countries like Britain and France have concluded special, so-called

preferential agreements of co-operation etc. with the former colonial countries, which ensure them almost exclusive economic and commercial privileges. The so-called dollar, sterling, franc, or ruble areas indicate an economic division of the world among the monopolies and various imperialist states.

US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers ensure maximum profits in different ways, through the discriminatory and unequal trade they carry on with these countries. Today the «developing» countries alone, excluding the OPEC countries, have a debit balance which amounts to about 34 billion dollars.

In the present conditions, especially now in the conditions of the economic crisis, the monopolies conclude direct agreements also with the governments of capitalist countries on production quotas, prices, markets, etc. The existence of such organisms as the European Common Market, Comecon, etc., is also clear evidence of the economic division of the world which exists today.

This economic division of the world, the domination of monopolies, their dictate over the life and economic development of other countries is making the contradiction between labour and capital, as well as the contradictions between the peoples and imperialism, and the inter-imperialist contradictions, much more severe.

The Chinese theory of the «three worlds»,

which seeks to reconcile the «third world» with the «second world» and with US imperialism, is out of step with this reality. It does not want to see that the relentless offensive of American, British, German, Japanese, French and other monopolies towards what China calls the «third world» is increasing the resistance of the peoples to all imperialist and hegemony-seeking powers and extending the objective conditions for the irreconcilable struggle among them. On the other hand, the unequal development of imperialist powers, which is an objective law of the development of capitalism, drives them to competition and abrasive frictions with one another, in their quest for economic expansion everywhere in the world.

The Chinese theory of «three worlds», which seeks to reconcile these contradictions and advocates precisely what social-democracy and the revisionists of every hue have long been preaching, is in flagrant opposition to the Leninist strategy, which, far from denying these contradictions, aims to deepen them in order to prepare the proletariat for revolution and the peoples for liberation.

In his analysis of imperialism, Lenin pointed out that, with the transition of pre-monopoly capitalism to its highest and last stage, **the stage of imperialism, the territorial division of the world among the great imperialist powers is completed.**

«...the characteristic feature of the period under review is the final partition of the globe, final not in the sense that **repartition** *is impossible; on the contrary, repartitions are possible and inevitable — but in the sense that the colonial policy of the capitalist countries* **has completed** *the seizure of unoccupied territories on our planet. For the first time, the world is completely divided up, so that in the future* **only** *re-division is possible, that is, territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another...»**.

Since the Second World War, the old classical colonialism, which exploited most of the peoples of the world physically, economically, politically and ideologically, has been transformed into a new colonialism. This new colonialism comprises an entire system of economic, political, military and ideological measures, which imperialism has built up with the aim of maintaining its domination and ensuring political control and economic exploitation of the former colonies and many other countries, while adapting itself to the new conditions created after the war.

What are these new conditions?

After the war, the imperialist countries —

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, pp. 308-309 (Alb. ed.).

France, Britain, Italy, Germany, Japan and America were not in a position to maintain the situation which existed before the war by force. France, for instance, could no longer keep Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and other countries of Africa in a colonial status, as it did in the past. The same can be said also of British, Italian, and other imperialisms.

The Second World War brought about a radical change in the ratio of forces in the world. It led to the defeat of the great fascist powers, but it also greatly weakened the old colonialist powers and shook them to their foundations. Everywhere, even in the countries which were not involved in the cyclone, the anti-fascist war gave rise to the problem of national liberation. Those peoples of the former colonial countries, which took part in the war together with the countries of the anti-fascist coalition in order to escape the fascist yoke, could not return to colonial bondage or tolerate it any longer. The victory of the Soviet Union over nazism, the creation of the socialist camp, China's liberation, gave a very powerful impulse to the awakening of the peoples' national consciousness and their liberation struggle. The broad masses of the peoples in the colonies came to understand that the former situation had to be changed. Liberation wars broke out in Indochina, North Africa, and elsewhere.

Forced by this situation, many colonialist

countries realized that the old method of exploitation and administration of colonies without any sort of freedom and independence was outdated. The colony-owning imperialist powers reached this conclusion not because of their democratic feelings or their desire to give the peoples freedom, but because of the pressure by the colonized peoples and because these powers were militarily, economically, politically, and ideologically too weak to maintain the old colonialism. But French, British, Italian, American and other imperialisms did not want to give up the exploitation of these peoples and countries. In the existing circumstances each imperialist power was obliged to grant autonomy to these peoples or to promise them freedom and independence after a certain time. During this period, which they allowed allegedly for the creation of the consciousness of self-government and the training of local cadres for this, their real aim was to prepare other, new forms of imperialist exploitation, the new colonialism, while creating the false impression among these countries and peoples that allegedly they had won their freedom.

This was a stage after the war when world imperialism suffered a great defeat, when the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism became even more pronounced. At this period of the decay of capitalism, as a result of the weakening of imperialism by the Second World War, the United States of America seized the opportunity and saddled

the colonial peoples, who were allegedly free and independent, with a new, more intensive exploitation. It extended its imperialist power over the former colonies of the other imperialist powers, which had already been weakened in one way or another.

Although they had won recognition of that sort of «independence» and «freedom», which the former colonialist powers granted them, many former colonial peoples were forced to take up arms, because the imperialists were not disposed to give them this «freedom» and this «independence» immediately. The French imperialists, in particular, even after the war, were still trying to preserve the power of France, or its «grandeur». Thus, the peoples of Algeria, Vietnam, and many others started their protracted struggle for liberation and, in the end, they won it. Here we are not going into detail about how they achieved it, which were the social forces that fought, etc. The fact is that the old French and British imperialism was weakened. Thus Lenin's theses that imperialism was in decay, that the old capitalist-imperialist society was being eroded by the revolutionary movements and the freedom-loving aspirations of the peoples, who had been oppressed and enslaved up till that time, was confirmed.

During this period American imperialism grew fat, expanded the dollar area, placed territories of the franc and sterling areas under its con-

trol, and, in order to protect its hegemonic imperialist power founded on the maximum exploitation of the peoples, it set up numerous military bases and established pro-American political cliques in many of those countries of the world which had allegedly gained their freedom and independence. This exploitation was, of course, associated with a series of changes in the structure and superstructure as well.

Finance capital has also created its own special ideology, which precedes it in its exploitation of the proletariat and the conquest of the world. It completes its domination of the peoples, and justifies this domination by various sugar-coated forms of bogus freedom, independence, as well as by creating some so-called democratic parties, etc.

With the creation of banks and multinational companies, along with US capital investments, the American way of life, with the degeneration inherent in it, is also exported.

The export of capital by the big imperialist powers creates the colonies which, today, are the countries where neo-colonialism reigns. These countries have an alleged independence but it is only formal. In other words, now as in the past, the same process of the export of capital is going on, though in different forms, with «honeyed» explanations and propaganda. The ruthless exploitation of the peoples of these countries remains the

same or becomes even more ferocious; and the plunder of natural assets continues.

The biggest neo-colonialist power of our time is the United States of America. In the three years, 1973-1975, the government and private capital investments of the United States of America in the former colonies, dependent or semi-dependent countries, represented about 36 percent of the total investments of the most developed capitalist and revisionist countries in these regions[1].

The economic, political and military treaties and agreements between the imperialist powers and the former colonial countries are enslaving, are weapons in the hands of imperialism to keep these countries in bondage. The words of Lenin who stressed

> *«...the need constantly to explain and expose among the broadest working masses of all countries, and particularly of the backward countries, the deception systematically practised by the imperialist powers, which, under the guise of politically independent states, in fact, set up states that are wholly dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily,»**

are just as valid today as in the past.

1 Statistical Yearbook of FGR, 1977.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 159 (Alb. ed.).

In order to keep the peoples under their domination, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, old or new, incite quarrels wherever they can among neighbour states, or among different social groups within a given country, and then, in the role of the judge or the supporter of one side or the other, interfere in the internal affairs of others, and justify their economic, political and military presence there. The facts show that whenever the superpowers have meddled in the internal affairs of other peoples, the problems have remained unsolved or the result has been the consolidation of the positions of imperialism and social-imperialism in these countries. The events in the Middle East, the conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia, the war between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc. bear witness to this.

Together with their investments, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all the other capitalist countries consolidate, also, their positions in the countries which accept these investments, as they struggle for markets and spheres of influence. This leads to frictions among different capitalist states, and among big concerns which are not linked with or interdependent on one another. These frictions kindle local wars and may even lead to a general war. As Leninism teaches us, a war that breaks out for these reasons, whether local or general, has a predatory and not a

liberation character. Only when the peoples rise against foreign invaders, when they rise against the local capitalist bourgeoisie, which is closely linked up with imperialism, social-imperialism and world capital, is this a just, liberation war.

The representatives of big world capital are indulging in a great deal of talk about the alleged need for amendments to the present system of international economic relations and the creation of a «new world economic order», which the Chinese leaders, too, support. According to them, this «new economic order» will serve as a «basis for global stability». For their part, the Soviet revisionists speak about the creation of a so-called new structure of international economic relations.

These are efforts and plans of imperialist and neo-colonialist powers, which want to keep neo-colonialism alive, prolong its existence, and preserve their oppression and plunder of the peoples. But the laws of the development of capitalism and imperialism are subject neither to the wishes nor to the theoretical inventions of the bourgeoisie and the revisionists. As Lenin said, the consistent fight against colonialism and neo-colonialism, the revolution, is the way out of these contradictions.

In analysing the fundamental economic features of imperialism, Lenin also defined its place in history. He stressed that **imperialism is not only the highest stage but also the final stage of capital-**

ism, the eve of the proletarian revolution. Lenin pointed out:

> *«Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism. . . is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic or decaying capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism»**.

The reality of the present-day capitalist world fully confirms this conclusion.

The economic basis of all the socio-economic ills of imperialism, as Lenin proved, is monopoly. Monopolies are powerless to overcome the contradictions of the capitalist economy. Lenin linked the parasitism and decay of imperialism organically with the tendency of monopoly to inhibit the development of the productive forces in general, to deepen the disproportional development between branches and of the national economy as a whole, to fail to utilize the human and material productive capacities, with the tendency to hinder the application of the new developments of science and technology to the benefit of the masses and the progress of the entire society.

The greed for profits, the competition, force the monopolies to invest in advanced technology in the process of production. But in the entire historical process of the development of imperialism,

---

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 23, p. 122 (Alb. ed.).

the dominant tendency is towards disproportional development and restraint on development.

Expenditure on research and the development of science in the field of industry, and especially the war industry, in the United States of America, for instance, has increased from 2 billion dollars in 1950, to almost 11 billion in 1965, and about 30 billion in 1972. Frequently the big firms come up against difficulties in scientific research, but once something is discovered, they buy up the patents and hire qualified workers; however they apply the research only when their own interests require this.

Naturally, the most important sectors, which present more interest for investments in the field of development and the technical revolution, have priority, because they offer greater possibilities for profits. War industry tops the list, as it is here that the rate of profit is highest. For example, in 1964 the United States of America invested 3,565 million dollars in scientific research in the sector of aviation and missiles. In the same year, 1,000,537 thousand dollars were invested in the electrical and telecommunications industry, 196 million in the chemical industry, 136 million in the machine-building industry, 174 million in the automobile industry, 172 million in scientific instruments, 38 million in the rubber industry, 8 million in the oil industry, 9 million in the methane industry, etc.

In today's conditions the militarization of the

economy, as a manifestation of the decay of imperialism, has become a characteristic feature of all the capitalist and revisionist countries. But the process of the militarization of the economy has assumed unprecedented proportions, especially in the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The direct military spending by both sides has increased to astronomical proportions, reaching a joint total of over 240 billion dollars a year.

In their policy of hegemony and world domination, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are also making extensive use of the arms trade, which is another clear expression of the decay of imperialism. Every year they sell more than 20 billion dollars worth of weapons. The other imperialist states, such as Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, etc., also engage in selling arms. The regular customers of this imperialist trade are such reactionary and fascist cliques as those of Chile, Brasil, Argentine, Israel, Spain, South Korea, Rhodesia, the South African Union, etc. Also numbered among these customers are the countries rich in strategic raw materials or oil, to which the imperialists offer their weapons as a bait to induce them to allow the plunder of their wealth.

The ever more frequent outbreak of economic crises of overproduction is clear proof of the decay and parasitism of present-day monopoly capitalism. The outbreak of crises, which have

now become very deep, confirms the correctness of the Marxist theory on the anarchic, spontaneous and disproportional character of production and consumption, and refutes the bourgeois «theories» on the development of capitalism «without crises», or the transformation of capitalism into «regulated capitalism».

The general law of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx, that the impoverishment of working people grows, on the one hand, while the profits of the capitalists increase, on the other hand, is operating with ever greater force in capitalist society today. The process of the polarization of society into proletarians and into bourgeois, who represent a limited number of people, is deepening.

The present-day imperialist system, which has greater economic possibilities to corrupt the upper strata of the proletariat, the worker aristocracy, has increased the latter to very large proportions.

The financial oligarchy is making extensive use of this aristocracy today, to deceive and confuse the proletariat, to dampen its revolutionary ardour. It is from this worker aristocracy that those whom Lenin calls socialists in words but imperialists in deeds, usually emerge. Social-democracy, the «bourgeois workers' parties», the opportunist leaders of trade-unions, the modern revisionists, etc., all come within this description

of Lenin's. Lenin stresses that imperialism is linked with opportunism, that the opportunists assist to preserve and strengthen imperialism. He says:

> *«. . .the most dangerous of all are those who do not wish to understand that the fight against imperialism is a sham and humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism»*.*

The decay of imperialism is clearly seen also in the growth and intensification of reaction in all fields, and especially in the political and social fields. As practice confirms, when the monopoly bourgeoisie sees that the class struggle is becoming acute, it casts off all disguise and denies the working masses even those few rights they have won by shedding their blood. The fascist regimes and dictatorships which have been established in many countries of the world are evidence of this.

All this rotten system, which is in a chaotic state, is propped up by a huge praetorian army, by very large numbers of police mobilized and armed to the teeth. All these military and police forces are set in motion to prevent or suppress any kind of resistance which goes beyond the limits defined

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 367 (Alb. ed.).

by a jungle of laws made by the ruling bourgeoisie. The cadres of the armed forces and other instruments of oppression live in affluence and receive fat salaries. In Italy, for instance, you hear nothing but talk about the army, the police, the carabinieri, about security agents who are decorated, but also killed.

In this very confused situation which prevails in the bourgeois states, gangsterism has developed and become widespread, and this is bred by the capitalist order itself. It is an expression of its degeneration, a reflection of the desperation and confusion to which the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation gives rise. The bourgeoisie tries to prevent those cases of gangsterism which cause it problems and worry the bourgeois state. But it incites and uses gangsterism to terrorize the broad working masses who live in poverty. In many capitalist countries gangsterism has become an industry and has extended from robbing banks and stores to kidnapping people and holding them to ransom for large sums of money. In some countries gangsterism has been organized in different groupings. These groupings often have names with a «revolutionary», or «communist» sound. The bourgeoisie allows them a free hand to operate in order to prepare the situation for, and justify the staging of, a fascist coup d'état. In order to discredit the revolution and socialism, this gangster activity is publicized

as though it is carried out by «communist groups» which are allegedly operating against the bourgeois order.

As a conclusion, we can say that in the present situation of imperialism as a whole, of US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as other imperialisms, imperialism of whatever description is at the stage of weakening and decay, and that the old society will be overthrown to its foundations by the revolution, and will be replaced by a new society, socialist society. This new socialist society exists and will extend, it will develop, gain ground regardless of the fact that the Soviet revisionists betrayed socialism in the Soviet Union, regardless of the fact that opportunism prevails in China and a new social-imperialism is rising there, regardless of the fact that capitalism has been restored in the erstwhile countries of people's democracy. Socialism will pursue its own course and will triumph over world imperialism and capitalism through struggle and efforts, but never, in any way, through reforms and peaceful parliamentary roads, as Khrushchev preached and as all the revisionists are preaching. It will triumph by remaining loyal to the Leninist theory on imperialism and the proletarian revolution and never by following the present-day revisionist theories which proclaim state monopoly capitalism to be an allegedly new, special stage

of capitalism, to be the «birth of socialist elements in the bosom of capitalism».

Proceeding from Lenin's conclusions on the nature of imperialism and its place in history, as a result of the contradictions eroding it from within and people's liberation and revolutionary struggles, the whole of world imperialism as a social system no longer has that undivided power to dominate it once possessed. This is the dialectics of history and it confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis that imperialism is on the decline, in decadence and decay.

The trend towards the weakening of capitalism and imperialism is the main trend of world history today. Marx and Lenin argued this on the basis of concrete facts, historical events, and materialistic dialectics. The trend towards united efforts by states opposed to imperialism also leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this latter tendency, which China absolutizes without making the necessary differentiations, without studying the particular situations, does not lead to the correct road. While claiming that US imperialism is in decline and less powerful than Soviet social-imperialism, while proclaiming the «third world» as the main motive force of the epoch, in practice the Chinese leaders are encouraging capitulation and submission to the bourgeoisie.

It is true that the peoples want liberation, but

they can gain this liberation only through struggle, through efforts, and headed by a militant leadership. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin teach us that this leadership is the proletariat of each country. But the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties must make thorough-going political, economic and military analyses, weigh everything in the balance, make decisions and define the appropriate strategy and tactics, always bearing in mind the preparation and carrying out of the revolution. If the revolution is forgotten, as it is by the Chinese, neither the analyses, actions, strategy, nor the tactics can be Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary.

We cannot have any illusions about imperialism of any kind, either powerful or less powerful. Imperialism from its nature creates the conditions for economic and political expansion, for unleashing wars, because its character is essentially exploitative, aggressive. Therefore, to deceive the broad masses of the peoples who want liberation, that they will achieve this if they are guided by such revisionist theories as that of «three worlds», is to perpetrate a crime against the peoples and the revolution.

Our epoch, as Lenin teaches us, is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. We Marxist-Leninists must understand from this that we have to combat world imperialism, any

imperialism, any capitalist power, which exploits the proletariat and the peoples, with the greatest severity. We stress the Leninist thesis that the revolution is now on the order of the day. The world is going to advance towards a new society which will be the socialist society. World capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism will become even more decayed and will come to an end through the revolution.

Lenin teaches us that **we must fight imperialism to the finish, must criticize it in the broad sense of the term and rouse the oppressed classes against the policy of imperialism, against** the **bourgeoisie.** The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the development of imperialism today clearly shows that nothing in Lenin's analysis and conclusions on the nature and features of imperialism and the revolution can be altered. The attempts of all opportunists, from the social-democrats down to the Khrushchevite and Chinese revisionists, to distort the Leninist theses on imperialism are counter-revolutionary. Their aim is to negate the revolution, to prettify imperialism and to prolong the life of capitalism.

When Lenin exposes imperialism and its apologists like Bernstein, Kautsky, Hilferding and all the other opportunists of the Second International, he points out:

«Imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. No Chinese wall separates it from the other classes»[*].

Unfortunately, however, even the «Chinese wall» has now been breached and the imperialist propaganda and ideology have penetrated China. The Chinese opportunists are not in the least original. Treading the road of Kautsky and company, they, too, are prettifying imperialism, in general, and American imperialism, in particular, presenting the latter as an imperialism in retreat, on which the peoples should rely in order to defend themselves from the Soviet social-imperialists.

The similarity between the «theories» of the Chinese revisionists and those of Kautsky is all too obvious. In his time, Kautsky tried to defend the colonial policy of imperialism, to cover up its exploitation and expansion, by distorting the Marxist theory on the development of capitalism. This is also being done today by the Chinese leaders who, in an effort to support American imperialism and its neo-colonialist policy, churn out absurd theories allegedly based on Marx or Lenin. However, to speak in the terms Lenin used, the Chinese «theory» is a plunge into the mire of revisionism and opportunism.

Kautsky's theory spread the illusion that

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 347 (Alb. ed.).

allegedly in the conditions of monopoly capitalism, the possibility exists of another, non-annexionist policy. In this connection Lenin stressed:

> *«The essence of the matter is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred' by finance capital, and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which, he alleges, is possible on this very same basis of finance capital. It follows, then, that monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexionist methods in politics. It follows, then, that the territorial division of the world, which was completed precisely during the epoch of finance capital, and which constitutes the basis of the present peculiar forms of rivalry between the biggest capitalist states, is compatible with a non-imperialist policy. The result is a slurring-over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth; the result is bourgeois reformism instead of Marxism»*.

Ignoring the fact that the monopolies, fi-

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, p. 328 (Alb. ed.).

nance capital, dominate the economic field in the United States of America, and that it is precisely they who dictate the home and foreign policy, the Chinese revisionists talk about a peaceful imperialism which no longer seeks expansion and indeed is on the retreat. The Chinese leaders «forget» Stalin's words that the main features and requirements of the fundamental economic law of present-day capitalism are,

> «. . .*the securing of the maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of the given country, through the enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and, lastly, through wars and militarization of the national economy, which are utilized for the obtaining of the highest profits*»*.

Thus, the «new» theories of the Chinese leaders show that they are singing Kautsky's old song to a new tune.

While exposing the chieftains of the Second International, who wanted to make a distinction between imperialist powers on the basis of which

---

* J. V. Stalin, «Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR», p. 45, 1974 (Alb. ed.).

were more aggressive and which less aggressive, Lenin stressed that this stand was anti-Marxist. This attitude impelled the parties of the Second International to the positions of chauvinism, to open betrayal of the cause of the proletariat and the revolution. In our epoch, said Lenin, there can be no question of which of the imperialist states involved in the First World War, on one side or the other, is the «greater evil».

> «*Present-day democracy,*» says he, «*will remain true to itself, only if it joins neither one nor the other imperialist bourgeoisie, only if it says that 'the two sides are equally bad', and if it wishes the defeat of the imperialist bourgeoisie in every country. Any other decision will in reality be national-liberal and have nothing in common with the genuine internationalism*»*.

In the present conditions, if the Chinese thesis, according to which Soviet social-imperialism is more aggressive than American imperialism, were to be accepted, this would lead to open betrayal of the revolution, of the historic mission of the working class, to going over to the positions of the Second International. The two imperialist superpowers represent to the same degree the

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 21, pp. 145-146 (Alb. ed.).

main enemy and danger to socialism, the freedom and independence of the peoples, and the sovereignty of nations. They are the main defenders of world capitalism.

In order to conceal their betrayal of the peoples, the Chinese leaders say that the relations of the big monopolies with some countries which possess great wealth create a situation in which even conflicts between the monopoly powers and the peoples can be avoided. This is a monstrous absurdity, an attempt to present ferocious imperialism as tame, to create a false situation of euphoria that allegedly the investment of capital will create wellbeing for the people of the country in which the investment is made, and thus the antagonistic contradictions between the imperialists and the peoples of these countries will no longer exist. This false theory, which is now being trumpeted by the Chinese leaders, has been concocted by imperialism in order to extend its domination everywhere in the world and to assist the reactionary cliques ruling in the various countries to oppress their own peoples and to sell their countries to the foreigners.

These «theories» are a repetition, in new, refined forms, of the reactionary theories of the opportunists of the Second International. At the time of the First World War, Lenin exposed Kautsky's anti-Marxist theory of «ultra-imperialism». Kautsky alleged that wars could be pre-

vented under imperialism, through an agreement among the capitalists of various countries.

In his polemic with Kautsky, Lenin said:

> «. . .*in the realities of the capitalist system, and not in the banal philistine fantasies of English parsons or of the German 'Marxist' Kautsky, 'inter-imperialist' or 'ultra-imperialist' alliances, no matter what form they may assume, whether of one imperialist coalition against another, or a general alliance embracing* all *the imperialist powers, are inevitably nothing more than a 'truce' in periods between wars*»*.

These teachings of Lenin's are very relevant in the present conditions when the Chinese revisionists are talking about, and making feverish efforts to set up, an alliance and a great world front of all the fascist and feudal, capitalist and imperialist states and regimes, including the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism.

Alliances between imperialist countries, Lenin stressed, are possible, but they are created for the sole purpose of jointly crushing the revolution and socialism, of jointly plundering the colonies and dependent and semi-dependent countries.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 22, pp. 359-360 (Alb. ed.).

The Chinese revisionists, like the chieftains of the Second International, have substituted the pragmatic slogan, «Let us unite with all those who can be united» against Soviet social-imperialism, for the slogan of the Communist Manifesto, «Proletarians of all countries, unite!».

The theory of the «three worlds» invented by the Chinese leaders does not analyse the historical development of imperialism from the Marxist-Leninist class standpoint, but sees it in a distorted light, ignoring the contradictions of our time which Marx and Lenin defined so clearly. Following this «theory», «socialist» China unites with American imperialism and the «second world», that is, with other imperialists who exploit the peoples, and calls on the «third world», the peoples who aspire to fight against world imperialism and capitalism, whether American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism, to unite against Soviet social-imperialism only.

The Titoite theory of «non-aligned» countries, too, is just as anti-Marxist as the theory of the «three worlds».

These two «theories» are the rails of the one railroad on which the train of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism is running, a train loaded with the wealth plundered from the peoples of the world. The Titoites and the Chinese revisionists are trying to open some holes in the trucks of this imperialist and social-imperialist

train, so that a little oil, sugar, a few dollars, pounds, francs or rubles may leak out. These rails which have been laid over the backs of the oppressed peoples, and which are intended to keep these peoples in permanent bondage, are two theories just as reactionary as all the other anti-Marxist theories of the Trotskyites, anarchists, Bukharinites, Khrushchevites, of the supporters of Togliatti, Carrillo, Marchais, etc., etc.

Life is constantly confirming Lenin's theses of genius on imperialism. Capitalism has entered the phase of its decay. This situation is arousing the revolt of the peoples and impelling them to revolution. The struggle of the peoples against imperialism and the bourgeois capitalist cliques is building up in various forms, with varying intensities. Quantity will inevitably turn into quality. This will happen first in those countries which constitute the weakest link of the capitalist chain and where the consciousness and organization of the working class have reached a high level, where there is a deep political and ideological understanding of the problem.

Imperialism has stepped up its barbarous oppression and exploitation of the peoples. But, at the same time, the peoples of the world are becoming more and more conscious that they cannot go on living in capitalist society, where the working masses are no less oppressed and exploited than in the pre-War period.

Despite all the efforts by imperialism and its hangers-on, it will find no stability, now or in the future, in its struggle to establish its hegemony over the peoples. It cannot find stability because of the awakening consciousness of the working class and the masses of oppresed working people who want liberation, as well as because of the inevitable inter-imperialist contradictions.

The peoples are seeing, and later they will see ever more clearly, that world imperialism and capitalism are not based solely on the economic, military, political and ideological strength of the two superpowers, but are based also on the wealthy classes which keep the peoples of their own countries in bondage, under exploitation and under fear so they will not rise up to gain their true freedom and independence.

The broad masses of various peoples of the world have also begun to understand that the present-day bourgeois-capitalist society, the exploiting system of world imperialism, must be overthrown. For the peoples this is not just an aspiration, in many countries they have taken up arms.

Therefore, there is no need to concoct theories which divide the world into three or four parts, into «aligned» and «non-aligned», but the great objective historical process must be seen and interpreted correctly, according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. The world is divided in two,

the world of capitalism and the new world of socialism, which are locked in a merciless struggle with each other. In this fight the new, the socialist world, will triumph, while the old capitalist society, the bourgeois and imperialist society, will be overthrown.

III

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES

Marx showed with scientific argument the necessity for the destruction of capitalist society and the construction of a more advanced society, socialism and then communism. Developing Marx's thought, in his book «Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism», Lenin showed that the present epoch is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. This is the epoch of the destruction of the old capitalist order, colonialism and imperialism, of the seizure of state power by the proletariat and the liberation of the oppressed peoples, the period of the triumph of socialism on a world scale.

This means that today we are living in the epoch of the replacement of the old exploiting society, which is intolerable for the majority of mankind, for the oppressed and exploited, with a new society in which the exploitation of man by man is done away with once and for all. It was

precisely from these fundamental teachings and its Marxist-Leninist analysis of the process of world development today that our Party proceeded when, at its 7th Congress, it put forward the thesis that the world is at a stage in which the question of the revolution and liberation of the peoples is a problem demanding solution.

The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a stern, merciless struggle which goes on continuously. Confronting each other stand two great social forces. On the one side stands the capitalist-imperialist bourgeoisie, which is the most ferocious, deceitful and blood-thirsty class known to history. On the other side stands the proletariat, the class totally dispossessed of means of production, ruthlessly oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie, which is at the same time the most advanced class of society which thinks, creates, works and produces, but does not enjoy the fruits of its toil.

Each of these classes strives to rally forces around itself and prepare them for its own aims: the proletariat, for social and national liberation, to carry out the revolution; the bourgeoisie, to preserve its domination and suppress the revolution. The bourgeoisie gathers around itself the most ominous, regressive and criminal forces, while the proletariat strives to win all the revolutionary, progressive forces over to its side.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the strug-

gle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie builds up continuously and will certainly be crowned with the victory of the proletariat and its allies. But for this struggle to be crowned with success, the proletariat must be organized, must have its own vanguard party, must make the broad masses of the people conscious of the necessity for revolution, and lead them in the fight to seize state power, to establish its own dictatorship, to build socialism and communism, the classless society.

There are many hot-heads in the world, with good or evil intentions, who think that the revolution can be carried out at any time, at any moment, at any place. But such people are mistaken. The revolution cannot be carried out at any time and at any place, according to one's wishes. The revolution breaks out and is carried through at that link of the capitalist chain which is the weakest. For the revolution to break out and triumph, the appropriate objective and subjective conditions must exist, and the favourable moment must be found for launching into revolution. The main thing is that, when they start the revolution, the broad masses of the people, with the proletariat at the head, must be determined and prepared to carry it through to the end.

Lenin stresses that the revolution is carried out by the people of each country, that it is not exported. This does not mean that the Marxist-

Leninists, wherever they are militating, should not feel themselves in solidarity, should not be linked with one another by the purest feelings of proletarian internationalism, and should not assist the struggle of the proletariat and peoples of other countries for their liberation. On the contrary, all communists, all proletarians, all the revolutionary forces in the various countries are duty bound to assist the revolution in each particular country and all over the world, through propaganda, agitation, material aid, the example of their determination and selflessness, and by faithful adherence to Marxism-Leninism. Of course, success in the utilization of this assistance depends, first of all, on the preparation of the proletariat and its party, on the development of the revolutionary struggle in this or that country.

In the «Manifesto of the Communist Party» Marx and Engels show that the interests of the proletariat and the people of one country are inseparable from the interests of the proletariat and peoples of the entire world.

As Lenin teaches us and life has confirmed, the revolution triumphs in each country individually. Therefore, this triumph depends, first of all, on the working class and its revolutionary party of each country, on their ability to implement the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolution in the concrete conditions.

However, a great deal of confusion has been

created around these teachings and especially around the Leninist theory on the revolution, many mines have been laid by the Titoite, Soviet, «Eurocommunist», Chinese, and other modern revisionists, who have taken it upon themselves to mislead people on the issue of the revolution and to prevent its outbreak.

Today, when this question is put forward for solution, it is an imperative duty for the Marxist-Leninists to dispel the fog the revisionists have spread about the revolution, to unmask their manoeuvres and deliberate misrepresentations about this problem, to expose their counterrevolutionary, chauvinist, hegemonic intentions, and to ensure that the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the revolution are understood and applied correctly.

We Must Defend and Implement the Marxist-Leninist Teachings on the Revolution

Marxism-Leninism teaches us and the experience of all revolutions has confirmed that for the revolution to break out and triumph, the objective and subjective factors must exist.

Lenin formulated this teaching in his book «The Collapse of the Second International», and developed it further in his book «'Left Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder» and other writings.

Dwelling on the revolutionary situation as the objective factor of the revolution, Lenin describes it as follows:

*«1) When it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule in an unchanged form,»** due to the deep crisis, which has involved these classes, a crisis which causes discontent and indignation among the oppressed classes. *«Usually, for the revolution to break out,»* he says, *«it is not enough for 'the lower strata not to want' to live in the old way; it is necessary also that 'the upper strata should be unable' to live in the old way. 2) When the want and suffering of the oppressed classes have become acute... 3) When, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who... are drawn into... independent actions of historic importance.»*** *«In other words, this truth can be expressed in this way: revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis (affecting both the exploited and the explciters)»****.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 21, p. 223 (Alb. ed.).
** Ibid.
*** V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 83 (Alb. ed.).

> «*Without these objective changes,*» he emphasizes, «*which are independent not only of the will of separate groups or parties, but even of separate classes, a revolution — as a general rule — is impossible*»*.

But not every revolutionary situation gives rise to revolution, says Lenin. In many cases, he says, revolutionary situations like those of the years 1860-1870 in Germany, or of the years 1859-1861 and 1879-1880 in Russia, were not transformed into revolutions, because of the absence of the subjective factor, that is, the high level of consciousness and readiness of the masses for the revolution,

> «*. . .the ability of the revolutionary* **class,**» as Lenin puts it, «*to carry out revolutionary mass actions* **strong** *enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which, never, not even in a period of crisis, 'falls' if it is not 'dropped'*»**.

In preparing the subjective factor, as Lenin wrote in his early works, the revolutionary party of the working class, its leadership, education and mobilization of the revolutionary masses play a decisive role. The party achieves this both by

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 21, p. 223 (Alb. ed.).
** Ibid.

working out a correct political line, which responds to the concrete conditions and the revolutionary desires and demands of the masses, and through a colossal amount of work, involving intensive and politically well-pondered revolutionary actions, which make the proletariat and the working masses conscious of the situation in which they are living, of the oppression and exploitation, of the barbarous laws of the bourgeoisie, and the absolute necessity for the revolution as a means to overthrow the enslaving order.

In this way, the poor strata will react with such intensity that even the wealthy, the bourgeoisie in power, shaken also by other internal and external contradictions, will have difficulty in continuing to rule as before. When these conditions are fulfilled, when the objective and subjective factors, which are linked with each other, exist, then it is possible for the revolution not only to break out but also to triumph.

Revolutionaries always ponder deeply over these theses of genius of Lenin, and not only ponder over them but also make concrete and all-round analyses of the situations. They act to ensure that they will never be taken by surprise by the revolutionary situations, so they will not find themselves disarmed at these decisive moments, but be able to utilize them for the preparation and launching of the revolution.

What does the analysis of the current situa-

tion in the world show? Proceeding from the Leninist theory of the revolution, the Party of Labour of Albania draws the conclusion that the situation in the world today is revolutionary in general, that this situation has matured, or is rapidly maturing, in many countries, while in other countries this process is developing.

When we say that the situation today is revolutionary, we mean that the world today is moving towards great outbursts. In general the situation today is like a volcano in eruption, a scorching fire, a fire which will burn precisely the oppressing and exploiting ruling upper classes.

The capitalist and revisionist world is in the grip of a grave, economic and political, financial and military, ideological and moral crisis. The present crisis, which has shaken the entire structure and superstructure of the bourgeois and revisionist order, has made the general crisis of the capitalist system even deeper and more acute.

The consequences of the crisis are clearly very grave and devastating, especially in the field of the economy. The deepening of the most severe economic crisis following the Second World War has been going on since 1974. It has brought about a decline of considerable proportions in industrial production: 20 percent in Japan, 15 percent in Great Britain, 14 percent in the United States of America, 18 percent in France and Italy, 10 percent in the Federal German Republic, etc. The

crisis has caused a very deep depression. In many capitalist countries unused productive capacites in some key branches of the economy have reached up to 25-40 percent and this situation is dragging on for years on end. That is why industrial production continues to stagnate. Colossal stocks of «surplus» goods remain unsold.

Yet, despite all these stocks of unsold goods and even though many productive capacities are not exploited, the monopolies' profits continue to increase because of rising prices. Prices are going up from day to day, while inflation has reached very high figures in certain countries.

Price rises and, in particular, inflation, have become a very convenient means in the hands of the monopolies and the capitalist and revisionist state to saddle the working class and other working people with the heavy burden of the crisis.

Under the pretext of checking inflation, the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist states increase the taxes on the incomes of the working masses and freeze their wages, and at the same time reduce taxation on the profits of the monopolies, devalue the currency, etc. These measures are directed against the working class and all working people, step up their exploitation and reduce their standard of living.

The long drawn-out economic crisis has worsened the living conditions of the working

class and peasant masses and made life very much harder for them. Unemployment has increased to proportions seldom seen before, and has become chronic, a major ulcer of bourgeois and revisionist society. In the capitalist-revisionist world, 110 million people have been thrown out in the streets. Only in the United States of America not less than 7-8 millions are unemployed. Today, hundreds of millions of people are living on the verge of starvation or actually starving. Hundreds of millions of people are tortured with the anxiety over insecurity for the morrow.

The poverty and insecurity for the broad masses of working people, as well as the reactionary, anti-popular internal and external policies followed by the capitalist and bourgeois-revisionist regimes have added and are continuously adding to the discontent of broad strata of the population. This grave situation has aroused their incontainable anger, which is expressed in strikes, protests, demonstrations, in clashes with the repressive organs of the bourgeois and revisionist order, and in many cases, even in real revolts. The popular masses are growing ever more hostile to the regimes ruling them.

Striving, even in this situation of crisis, to safeguard their maximum profits, the governments of imperialist, capitalist and revisionist countries make all sorts of fraudulent promises and proposals to placate the discontent and anger

of the masses and divert their minds from revolution.

Meanwhile, the poor are becoming even poorer, the rich even richer, the gap between poor and rich social strata, between the developed capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries is growing deeper and deeper.

The present crisis has also extended to political life, inciting contradictions among the ruling circles of the capitalist and revisionist states. Clear evidence of this is the great increase in government crises and the frequent replacement of teams in power.

The bourgeoisie and the ruling cliques are compelled to change the horses in their government teams more and more frequently, with the aim of deceiving the working people and bolstering their hopes that the fresh team will be better than the old one, of convincing them that the latter are to blame for the crisis and for failing to get out of it, while the former will improve the situation, and so on. This whole fraud, which is continuously conducted on broad proportions, is camouflaged with false slogans about freedom, democracy, etc., especially during electoral campaigns. At the same time, the bourgeoisie in the capitalist and revisionist countries is reinforcing its savage weapons of violence, the army, the police, the secret services, the courts, the control by its dictatorship over every movement and effort of the proletariat. In

the capitalist and revisionist countries today there is an obvious trend towards increased bourgeois violence and the limitation of democratic rights. The tendency towards the development of fascism in the life of the country and preparations for the establishment of fascism, at the moment when the bourgeoisie considers it impossible to rule by «democratic» methods and means, is becoming ever more evident.

The economic-financial and political crisis has gripped not only the monopolies, the governments, the political parties and forces inside each particular country, but also the international alliances, the economic, political and military blocs, like the European Common Market and Comecon, the European Community, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The contradictions, frictions, contests and quarrels between partners of these alliances and blocs, are manifesting themselves ever more openly and abrasively.

Another expression of the crisis and attempts to get out of it can be seen in the armaments race, the all-round preparations for war and the instigation of local wars by the superpowers and the other imperialist powers, such as those in the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, the Western Sahara, Indochina and elsewhere. This course serves the hegemonic and expansionist plans of one or the other imperialist power. It keeps alive and develops the war industry and the arms trade,

which have assumed unparalleled proportions today.

But all these political and military means are only palliatives which do not and cannot cure the ills of the gravely ailing capitalist revisionist system.

To the present economic and political crisis of the capitalist and revisionist world must also be added the unprecedented ideological and moral crisis. At no other time has there been such ideological confusion and moral corruption as that which is being seen today. At no other time have there been so many variants of bourgeois theories, right, middle or «left» decked out in every kind of secular and religious, classical and modern, openly anti-communist and allegedly communist and Marxist cloaks. At no other time has such moral corruption, such a degenerate way of life, or such great spiritual depression been witnessed. The bourgeois and revisionist theories, built up with so much effort and trumpeted so boastfully as «guides to salvation from the evils of the old society», such as the theories of the «final stabilization of capitalism», «people's capitalism», «the consumer society», «post-industrial society», «averting crises», «the technical-scientific revolution», Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence», «a world without armies, weapons and wars», «socialism with a human face», etc., etc., have now been shaken to their foundations.

All these aspects of the general crisis are to be found not only in Yugoslavia, where the consequences of the crisis are more obvious, but also in the social-imperialist Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries. Oppression and exploitation have been stepped up everywhere in these countries, all of them are suffering from the ills of capitalism, from the quarrels and conflicts over power and privileges in the ranks of the leaders and the upper strata; everywhere the popular masses are seething with dissatisfaction and anger. Thus, great possibilities for the revolution exist in these countries, too. The law of the revolution operates there the same as in every other bourgeois country.

It is precisely this situation of the present general crisis of capitalism, the trend of which is to become steadily deeper, that makes us draw the conclusion that the revolutionary situation has already enveloped or is in the process of enveloping the majority of capitalist and revisionist countries, and hence, that this situation has placed the revolution on the order of the day.

Under the ever greater pressure of the crisis and the defeats they have suffered in their predictions and their manoeuvres to strangle the revolution, the bourgeoisie and the revisionists are trying to find new expedients and to fabricate other fraudulent theories.

Today, the modern revisionists have unfurled

the banner of defence of the capitalist system, of oppression and exploitation of the peoples, of splitting the revolutionary and liberation movement, and in general, of the deception of the masses. But they, too, will suffer the same fate as the social-democrats and all other opportunists of the past, who have turned into simple lackeys of the bourgeoisie.

In the present situation of its grave economic, political and ideological crises, the bourgeoisie is demanding that its revisionist servants come out more openly in its support. This is forcing them more and more to drop their disguise, but also to become more thoroughly discredited. Lenin says:

> «*The opportunists are bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution, who in peaceful times carry on their bourgeois work in secret, concealing themselves within the workers' parties, while in times of crises they* **immediately** *prove to be open allies of the* **entire** *united bourgeoisie, from the conservative to the most radical and democratic part of the latter, from the freethinkers to the religious and clerical sections*»*.

This scientific conclusion of Lenin's is proved

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 21, p. 106 (Alb. ed.).

to the hilt by the service the modern revisionists are rendering the crisis-stricken capitalist system today.

Take Italy, for instance, the typical country in which the decay of capitalism, in its base and superstructure, is reflected. From the end of the Second World War up till now the Christian Democrats, the party of the big bourgeoisie, the party of the Vatican which has gathered all the religious-reactionary bourgeoisie and elements of the right around itself, have been in power in Italy. Their government is ruling a country which is in a state of bankruptcy. Right from 1945 to this day, the top strata of the bourgeoisie have been in the grip of such a grave crisis that, within that period there has been a succession of about 40 governments, «monocolour» Christian Democrat, socialist-Christian-Democrat, tripartite, Christian Democrat-socialist-socialdemocrat, «centro sinistra» governments, «centro destra» governments, etc.

The deep government crisis in Italy reflects that situation of the internal general crisis from which no way out can be found. The quarrels, conflicts, political murders and scandals, such as the removal of President Leone, the murder of the head of the Christian Democrat Party, Moro, etc., which are becoming more and more frequent, are consequences of the crisis.

Italy has become a bridgehead of the United

States of America. Its bankrupt economy, which has fallen into the clutches of American imperialism, is also linked with the European Common Market, where it is the partner with the least weight.

As a result of this situation, the broad working masses in Italy have been impoverished and are becoming more so. Italy has the highest level of unemployment among the countries of the European Common Market. Italy has the greatest emigration of the labour force and its imports are greater than its exports. By restricting their buying of food products from Italy, the member countries of the European Common Market, especially West Germany and France, have created a difficult situation in Italian agriculture. The export prices of Italian butter, milk, and fruit have fallen sharply while the cost of living in that country has become extremely high. Italy has become a country of big strikes in which workers from heavy and light industry and transport, down to postmen, airline crews and even the police take part.

In such a situation of seething discontent, when the interests of the masses and the revolution require that all this great discontent of the proletariat and the entire people should be channelled into the fight against the reactionary bourgeoisie, against its preparations for the fascist attack it is trying to launch, the Italian revisionists

and the reformist trade-unions, the entire worker aristocracy, as well as the supporters of the Chinese theory of the «three worlds», are acting as firemen to extinguish the flames of the revolution and as defenders of the bourgeois order.

This rotten bourgeois order is being defended by all the parties, from the fascist party to the Berlinguer's revisionist party. The Italian revisionist party is united with the bourgeoisie precisely to keep this bourgeois order, shaken to its foundations, in power. It is trying to weaken and suppress the revolutionary drive of the Italian proletariat by spreading the lie that it is following and applying a Marxism applicable to the conditions of its own country.

Not only did Berlinguer enter into negotiations with the Christian Democrats long ago, but he has even reached agreement with them, and indeed, without formally participating in the government, on many problems, he is governing together with them. The government supports this party, but at the same time, for the sake of appearances, makes believe that it disagrees with it. The Italian revisionist party, for its part, is playing the same game.

The Italian revisionists are raising a great clamour about a government program, agreed on by the five parties of the Italian parliamentary majority, which they are boosting as an «important victory», as a «new political phase» in their

country. But this political phase, that Berlinguer talks about, is the inclusion of the revisionist party in the plans of Italian capital. Berlinguer describes this as a serious, realistic, and undogmatic agreement. He claims that this agreement will bring about a real change, not only in the political relations among parties, but also in the entire economic, social and state life of the country.

Thus the Italian revisionists are going down precisely the road Lenin predicted for the different opportunists, who seek unity with capital in order to obstruct the revolutionary drive of the masses. With this unity, they think that they have come some way towards achieving their aim of going to socialism through pluralism. Obviously, this is nothing but a dream, and the President of the Italian Senate, Amintore Fanfani, is not at all mistaken when he describes this agreement among the five parties as a collection of dreams. It is a collection of dreams on the part of the Italian revisionists, whereas on the part of the forces of capital, it is by no means a dream, but a well-pondered act designed to liquidate the ideas of communism in Italy, and to block the claims of the Italian people and proletariat and suppress their revolutionary struggle for the construction of a new society. The Italian revisionists are now receiving a few crumbs, but, claiming that the government needs the participation of the revisionist party, they are trying to have the party

brought completely into the government, like a fish in its element. In a word, the Italian revisionist party is trying to become totally involved in the reactionary mess of Italian monopoly capital.

Berlinguer's party is an utterly degenerate party ideologically, with a completely reformist, parliamentarist, social-democratic program. It supports the order established by the pseudo-democratic Constitution in the formulation of which the Italian «communists» themselves, headed by Togliatti took part. It is precisely under this Constitution that the reactionary and clerical bourgeoisie has been making the law in Italy and oppressing the proletariat and the broad masses of the people for the past three decades. The so-called Italian communists find this oppression just and in conformity with the Constitution.

Inside or outside the Italian Parliament, through the press organs, television and radio, the Italian revisionist party together with the other parties of the bourgeoisie, with the Christian Democrat party at the head, is carrying out a policy accompanied with unrestrained demagogy which stupefy the Italian public, confuse and disorganize it day by day, in order to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat and the political consciousness of the working masses.

Italian reaction and the Vatican are in great need of all this activity. The Italian revisionist party is trying to suppress the revolutionary move-

ment of the masses of the people, headed by the proletariat, in order to hinder the revolution, to help the bourgeoisie out of its predicament and avert the overthrow of the existing order.

Take another example, Spain. After the death of Franco, King Juan Carlos came to power in Spain. He is the representative of the Spanish big bourgeoisie, which, seeing that during its long rule the fascist regime had plunged the country into a grave crisis, came to the conclusion that Spain could no longer be governed as in Franco's time. Therefore certain changes had to be made in the form of government and Franco's discredited Falange could no longer be kept in power. After a series of changes of heads of government, the people most trusted by the new king, the continuers of the reformed Francoism, took power.

Demonstrations and strikes broke out in Spain as never before. Through them the people demanded changes, naturally, not this «change» that took place, but deep-going and radical changes. The strikes, demonstrations and clashes there did not cease and are still going on. The masses are demanding freedoms and rights, and the different nationalities autonomy. In this situation, in order to mislead the masses in revolt, the government of Juan Carlos also legalized the revisionist party of Ibarruri-Carrillo. The heads of this party have become obedient flunkies of the Spanish monarchic regime, have turned into scabs

to hold back the great revolutionary drive which has built up in the existing situation and, in conjunction with the bourgeoisie, to suppress all the elements with revolutionary ideas from the Spanish War and admirers of the Republic.

Here, too, we see the fire brigade role of the Spanish revisionist party, identical with the role played by the Italian revisionist party, although it has less power than the latter.

The revisionist parties in France, Japan, the United States of America, Britain, Portugal and all the other capitalist countries are playing a similar role in defending the bourgeois order, enabling it to overcome the crises and revolutionary situations, to befuddle and paralyze the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses, who are understanding ever more clearly that it is no longer possible to live in the «consumer society» and other exploiting societies, and who are rising in revolt against the capitalist political and economic order.

The revisionist parties are particularly hostile to Leninism. This means that they are hostile to the revolution, because it was Lenin who elaborated the theory on the proletarian revolution to perfection and put it into practice in Russia. On the basis of this theory, the socialist revolution triumphed in Albania and other countries. The Leninist theory, which shows the way to the triumph of revolution everywhere, reveals the worth-

lessness of the counterrevolutionary revisionist theories about peaceful transition to socialism through the parliamentary road, without destroying the bourgeois state apparatus, indeed, according to them, even utilizing it for peaceful socialist transformations, with no need for the leadership of the proletariat and its vanguard party or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Precisely at these very revolutionary moments, when there are great possibilities for the revolution to break out at the weakest links of the capitalist chain, when there is extremely great need to raise the class consciousness of the proletariat, to prepare the subjective factor, to build up confidence in the correctness and universal character of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which shows the true road to the seizure of state power by the proletariat and other oppressed masses, the revisionists are rendering the bourgeoisie an invaluable service in its efforts to cope with and avert the revolution. That is why the bourgeoisie is striving in every way to involve the revisionist parties and the trade-unions under their influence in the fight against the revolution and communism. This is precisely the objective that the whole line of American imperialism, world capitalism and the bourgeoisie of every country is intended to achieve. The bourgeoisie wants the revisionist parties to place themselves openly and totally in the service of capital by operating under «commu-

nist» colours and allegedly fighting to change the situation, to create a new hybrid society in which not only the owning class and wealthy classes, but allegedly the poorer classes, too, will have their say, with the revisionist «communist» parties and the socialist parties passing themselves off as their representatives and champions.

The revisionists in power, in particular, the Yugoslav, Soviet and Chinese revisionists, are rendering world capitalism a very great service in the struggle to hold back and stamp out the revolutions.

The Yugoslav revisionists are declared enemies of Leninism. They are the most ardent propagandists of the negation of the universal character of the laws of the socialist revolution embodied in the October Revolution and reflected in the Leninist theory of the revolution. They preach that allegedly the world today is moving towards socialism spontaneously, therefore there is no need for revolution, for class struggle, etc. The Yugoslav revisionists present their capitalist system of «self-administration» as a model of true socialism, alleging that it is a panacea both against the «evils» of «Stalinist» socialism and against the evils of capitalism. According to them, the establishment of this system allegedly does not require violent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, state socialist ownership, or democratic centralism. «Self-administration» can be estab-

lished quietly and gently by agreement and collaboration between ruling circles, between employers and workers, between the government and property owners.

It is precisely because Yugoslav revisionism is an enemy of Leninism and sabotages the revolution that international capitalism, and especially American imperialism, is so «generous» in providing Titoite Yugoslavia with financial, material, political and ideological aid.

In words, the Soviet revisionists do not reject Leninism and the Leninist theory of the revolution, but they fight it in practice with their counterrevolutionary stands and activity. They are no less afraid of the proletarian revolution than the American imperialists or the bourgeoisie of any other country, because in their own country the revolution topples them from the thone, strips them of their power and class privileges, while in the other countries it ruins their strategic plans for world domination.

They try to present themselves as continuators of the October Revolution, as followers of Leninism, in order to deceive the proletariat and the working masses both in the Soviet Union and in other countries. They talk about «developed socialism» and «transition to communism» in order to put out any discontent, revolt, and revolutionary movement of the working masses in their country against the revisionist rule, and to sup-

press them as «counterrevolutionary», «anti-socialist» acts. Outside their country, they use «Leninism» as a mask to conceal their anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theories and practices, to open the way for the expansionist and hegemonic plans of social-imperialism.

The Soviet revisionists present the violent revolution in the developed capitalist countries as very dangerous at the present time, when, according to them, any revolutionary outburst could be transformed into a thermo-nuclear world war which will exterminate mankind. Therefore, they recommend the revolution on the peaceful road, the transformation of Parliament «from an organ of bourgeois democracy into an organ of democracy for the working people» as the most suitable road today. They also present «détente», the so-called easing of tension, which serves the aims of Soviet foreign policy, as «the general trend of world development today», which will allegedly lead to the peaceful triumph of the revolution on a world scale.

For demagogical purposes they do not deny the dictatorship of the proletariat, indeed, in theory they come out in defence of it, saying that, in specific instances, even violent revolution may be used. But they need these declarations especially to justify the plots and armed putsches which they organize in one country or another to establish pro-Soviet reactionary regimes and cliques

there, to divert the national liberation movements from the right road, and to put them under their hegemony, etc.

Now revisionist China, too, has become a zealous extinguisher of the revolution.

The entire internal and external policy of the Chinese revisionists is directed against the revolution, because the revolution upsets their strategy of making China an imperialist superpower.

Within China the revisionist leadership is savagely suppressing any revolutionary outburst of the working class and the other working masses against its bourgeois-counterrevolutionary stands and actions. It is striving in every way to cover up the contradictions of the present epoch, especially the contradiction between labour and capital, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Chinese revisionists say that there is only one contradiction in the world today, the contradiction between the two superpowers, which they present as a contradiction between the United States of America and all other countries of the world, on the one hand, and Soviet social-imperialism, on the other. Basing themselves on this fabricated thesis, they call on the proletariat and the peoples of every country to unite with the bourgeoisie of their countries «to defend the homeland and national independence» against the danger which comes only from Soviet social-imperialism. With this the Chinese revisionists preach to the masses

the idea of renouncing the revolution and the liberation struggle.

To the Chinese revisionists the problem of the proletarian and national liberation revolution is simply not a current issue, also because, according to them, nowhere in the world is there a revolutionary situation. Therefore, they advise the proletariat to shut itself up in libraries and study «theory», because the time for revolutionary actions has not come. In this context, it is clear how hostile and counterrevolutionary is the policy of the Chinese revisionists, who are splitting the Marxist-Leninist movement and hindering the unity of the working class in the fight against capital.

The Chinese press and propaganda, as well as the speeches of the Chinese leaders, make no mention at all of the big demonstrations and strikes which the entire proletariat is organizing in different capitalist countries today. This is because they do not want to encourage the revolt of the masses, because they do not want the proletariat to utilize these situations in their fight against oppression and exploitation. How hypocritical sound their bombastic and empty slogans that «the countries want independence, the nations want liberation and the people want revolution»!

Not only is the claim of the Chinese revisionists that there is no revolutionary situation in the world today contrary to the reality, but they also

demand that the proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party sit with its arms folded and refrain from undertaking any revolutionary action at all, from working to prepare the revolution. Long ago, at the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, Lenin had criticized such capitulationist views expressed by the Italian Serrati, according to whom no revolutionary actions should be carried out when there is no revolutionary situation.

> «*The difference between the socialists and Communists,*» said Lenin, «*consists in the former refusing to act in the way we act in any situation, i.e., conduct revolutionary work*»*.

This criticism by Lenin is a heavy slap in the face also for the Chinese modern revisionists, and all the other revisionists, who, like the social-democrats, are against revolutionary actions by the proletariat and the other working masses.

Lenin called Kautsky a renegade, because

> «*...he had completely distorted Marx' doctrine, tailoring it to suit opportunism, and that he had 'repudiated revolution in deeds, while accepting it in words*»**.

The Chinese revisionist leaders go a little further

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 277 (Alb. ed.).
** V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 28, p. 257 (Alb. ed.).

than Kautsky. They do not admit the necessity of the revolution even in words.

This reactionary line explains the profoundly counterrevolutionary policy and attitudes of the Chinese revisionist leadership, which is seeking in every way to enter into alliances and collaborate with US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, supports the European Common Market and NATO.

By entering into alliance and seeking unity with the US imperialists, who, together with the Soviet social-imperialists, are the most ferocious oppressors and exploiters and the arch-enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, as well as with the other imperialist rulers, with the blackest world reaction, while demanding that the proletariat of the European countries and the other developed capitalist countries bend their backs and submit to oppression by the bourgeoisie, the Chinese revisionists themselves are also participating in this oppression and uniting with world capitalism in the fight against the revolution, against socialism, and against the peoples' liberation.

As can be seen, world capitalism, with modern revisionism and all its other tools, is waging a fierce and many-sided fight on all fronts to stop revolutions from breaking out.

They are striving with might and main to overcome the crises, to cool or defuse the revolutionary situations in order to prevent them from

being transformed into revolution. However, the crises and revolutionary situations are objective phenomena, which do not depend on the will and desires of the capitalists, the revisionists or any one else. Only when the capitalist order of oppression and exploitation, which inevitably gives rise to them, has been wiped out, can they be avoided.

The imperialists, the other capitalists and the revisionists know well that the revolution does not break out spontaneously in periods of crises and revolutionary situations. Therefore they direct their attention and their main blows towards the subjective factor. On the one hand, they strive to stupefy and deceive the proletariat, the other working masses and the peoples, to hinder them from becoming conscious of the necessity for the revolution, and from uniting and organizing themselves; on the other hand, they fight to destroy the international Marxist-Leninist movement, to stop it from building up and gaining strength, so that it will not become a great leading political force of the revolution, so that the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of each country will not gain the political and ideological capacity to be able to unite, organize, mobilize, and lead the masses in revolution and to victory.

But, however much the imperialists, the capitalists, the revisionists and reactionaries strive and struggle, they cannot stop the wheel of history from rolling onwards. Their strivings and

struggle will come up against the revolutionary strivings and struggle of the proletariat and the freedom-loving peoples, while the modern revisionists will suffer the same fate as the social-democrats and all the opportunists of the past, all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism.

The Peoples' Liberation Struggle — a Component Part of the World Revolution

When we speak of the revolution we do not mean only the socialist revolution. In the present epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, the peoples' liberation struggle, the national-democratic, anti-imperialist revolutions, the national liberation movements, also, are component parts of a single revolutionary process, the world proletarian revolution, as Lenin and Stalin explained.

> «*Leninism,*» says Stalin, «*has proved... that the national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national problem is a part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution,*

*a part of the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat»**.

This connection has become even clearer and more natural today, when, with the collapse of the old colonial system, most of the peoples have taken a big step forward towards independence by creating their own national states, and when, following this step, they are aspiring to go further. They want the liquidation of the neo-colonialist system, of any imperialist dependence and any exploitation by foreign capital. They want their complete sovereignty and economic and political independence. It has now been proved that such aspirations can be realized, such objectives can be attained only through the elimination of any foreign domination by and dependence on foreigners and the liquidation of oppression and exploitation by local bourgeois and big land-owner rulers.

Hence, the linking and interlacing of the national-democratic, anti-imperialist, national liberation revolution with the socialist revolution, because, by striking at imperialism and reaction, which are common enemies of the proletariat and the peoples, these revolutions also pave the way for great social transformations, assist the victory of the socialist revolution. And vice-versa, by striking at the imperialist bourgeoisie, by destroy-

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 144 (Alb. ed.).

ing its economic and political positions, the socialist revolution creates favourable conditions for and facilitates the triumph of liberation movements.

This is how the Party of Labour of Albania sees the question of the revolution. It sees it from Marxist-Leninist positions, and that is why it gives all-out support and backing to the just struggles of the freedom-loving peoples against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and the other imperialist powers, against neo-colonialism, because these struggles assist the common cause of the destruction of imperialism, the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism in each country and on a world scale.

Therefore, when we draw the conclusion that the revolution is a question put forward for solution, that it is on the agenda, we have in mind not only the socialist revolution, but also the democratic anti-imperialist revolution.

The level of maturity of the revolutionary situation, the character and the development of the revolution cannot be the same for all countries. These things depend on the concrete historical conditions of each individual country, the stage of its economic and social development, the ratio of classes, the situation and the level of organization of the proletariat and the oppressed masses, the scale of the interference of foreign powers in the different countries, etc. Each country and

people has many specific problems of the revolution, which are very complicated.

At present, there is a great deal of talk about the situation in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the carrying out of the revolution there. The Chinese leaders see the question of the revolution and the independence and national liberation of these countries in a global way, as if it can be solved by means of the unity of the entire «third world», i.e., of states, classes, governments, etc., ignoring the concrete situations and problems of each individual country and region. This metaphysical view shows that the Chinese leaders are, in fact, against the revolution and the liberation of the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, that they are for the maintenance of the status quo, for the preservation of the imperialist and neo-colonialist domination in these countries.

We, too, speak about the question of the liberation of the African, Asiatic, Latin-American, Arab and other peoples. These peoples have many common problems which they must solve, but each of them also has very complicated specific problems.

The general and common task of these peoples is the liquidation of any foreign yoke, imperialist, colonial and neo-colonial, and the oppression by the local bourgeoisie. These peoples in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere are seething with anger and hatred against the for-

eign yoke, as well as against the yoke of the local bourgeois or landowner-bourgeois ruling cliques, sold out to the US imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, or the other imperialists. These peoples have now awakened and can no longer tolerate the plunder of their riches, their sweat and blood, can no longer reconcile themselves to the economic, social and cultural backwardness in which they live.

Arising from the struggle against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the main enemies of the revolution and the national and social liberation of the peoples, the struggle against the bourgeoisie and reaction, the peoples have many common interests, many common problems, and on this basis they must unite with one another.

The fight against Israel — the most bloodthirsty tool of US imperialism — which has become a great stumbling block to the advance of the Arab peoples, is a common problem for all these peoples. In practice, however, not all the Arab states are of one mind about the struggle they should wage jointly against Israel and about the character this struggle against their common enemy should have. Frequently, some of them see this struggle from a narrow nationalist angle. We cannotagreewithsuch a stand. We stick to our stand that Israel must withdraw to its own lair and

renounce its chauvinist, provocative, offensive and aggressive attitudes and actions against the Arab states. We demand that Israel give up the territories of the Arabs, that the Palestinians gain all their national rights, but we can never accept that the Israeli people should be wiped out.

The efforts of the peoples of the Arab countries for complete liberation from the clutches of imperialism and social-imperialism, for the strengthening of their freedom and sovereignty, are likewise the common problems of all these peoples.

However, each of the Arab peoples has its own characteristics, has specific problems, which are different from those of the others, and which arise from its socio-economic development, its cultural level, its state organization, the level of freedom and sovereignty achieved, the unification of clans and tribes in many of them, etc. To lump all these separate elements together and to demand that the question of freedom, independence, democracy and socialism must be solved for all these countries in the same manner and at the same time, is an impossibility.

In those Arab countries in which the interests of the bourgeoisie have been greatest, the various imperialists have invested considerable sums for the exploitation of natural assets and the peoples. To achieve this, certain working conditions had to be created, both for the colonizers and the colonized. Wherever the natural assets

have been most plentiful and the interests of the colonizers greatest, there the exploitation of the people and their wealth also have been more intensive. Naturally, the exploitation of assets has also brought about a certain development, but this cannot be considered as an overall, harmonious development of the economy of this or that country. The colonizers financed and assisted the chieftains of the principal tribes, who sold their souls and the riches of the peoples to the imperialist occupiers. In return they were given a small percentage from the colossal profits made by the colonizers.

Depending on the circumstances and the power of the state which had enslaved them, with these profits and the aid of their foreign patrons, the tribal chiefs created some sort of allegedly independent state, with the support and under the control of the colonizing country. In this way, with the aid of the colonizers, the tribal chiefs were turned into the wealthy bourgeois stratum of sheiks, who sold their territories, together with their peoples, for next to nothing, putting the peoples under a double bondage, that of the foreign colonizers and their own. Thus, the strata of the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, mediaeval kings, on the one hand, and the slaves, the proletariat working on the foreign concessions, on the other, were created and confronted one another in the Arab countries. With the

money and profits the foreign exploiters granted them, the upper strata adopted the mode of living of the European and American bourgeoisie. Their sons even attended the colonizers' schools, where they acquired some western culture. They passed themselves off as the representatives of their people's culture, but in fact, they were trained to keep the working masses in bondage and to allow the colonizers to continue the ruthless exploitation of the latter.

That Arab state which had greater wealth, developed more rapidly, another which was not so wealthy, developed more slowly, while the state which was poor, remained at a very low level of development.

Having an organization suitable for the imposition of radical oppression, and also having the armed forces in their hands, colonialism, the state power of feudal monarchs and the big land-owning bourgeoisie nipped in the bud any attempt at revolt, any claim, even for some very limited economic rights, let alone for political demands and the revolution.

In the development of the Arab states at the present day, they are not all faced with solving the same problems. The King of Saudi Arabia, for instance, has different problems and views the economic, political, organizational and military questions differently from the Emirs of the Persian Gulf who see these questions from quite another

angle and over a different range. Similarly, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, etc., all see their own problems from different points of views.

Therefore, when we speak of the Arab peoples, we arrive at the conclusion that, though they have many common interests, their problems are not identical and cannot be solved in the same way in one country as in another. Similarly, we cannot say that an alliance and a single opinion about the solution of common problems exist among these countries. The problems are different for each Arab state not only because of the differing stands of the governments of one or the other country, but also because of the attitudes of the colonial and neo-colonial states which still continue to make the law in most of them.

What has been said about the Arab peoples also applies to the peoples of the African continent. Africa is a mosaic of peoples with an ancient culture. Each African people has its own culture, customs, way of life, which, with some variations, are at a very backward stage, for well-known reasons. The awakening of the bulk of these peoples has only recently begun. *De jure*, the African peoples, in general, have won their freedom and independence. But there can be no talk of genuine freedom and independence, since most of them are still in a colonial or neo-colonial state. Many

of these countries are governed by the chieftains of the old tribes who have seized power and rely on the old colonialists, or the US imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. The methods of government in these states at this stage are not and cannot be other than a marked survival of colonialism. The imperialists are ruling most of the African countries again through their concerns, their capital invested in industry, banks, etc. The overwhelming bulk of the wealth of these countries continues to flow to the metropolises.

Some of the African countries have fought for that freedom and independence they enjoy today, while the others have had it granted without fighting. During their colonial rule in Africa, the British, French and other colonizers oppressed the peoples but they also created a local bourgeoisie, more or less educated in the Occidental manner. The leading figures today, have also emerged from this bourgeoisie. Among them there are many anti-imperialist elements, fighters for the independence of their own countries, but the majority either remain loyal to the old colonizers, in order to preserve the close relations with them even after the formal abolition of colonialism, or have entered into economic and political dependence on the US imperialists or the Soviet social-imperialists.

The colonizers did not make large investments in the past. This was the case, for instance,

with Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, etc. However, the colonizers drained the wealth of all these countries, seized large tracts of land, and developed a proletariat, by no means small in number, in some special branches of the industry, such as in the extraction and processing of raw materials. They also drew large numbers of workers to the metropolises, such as to France, for instance, but also to Britain, as a cheap labour force which worked in the colonizers' mines and the factories.

In the other parts of Africa, especially in Black Africa, industrial development remained more backward. All the countries of this region were divided up, especially between France, Britain, Belgium and Portugal. Great underground riches, like diamonds, iron, copper, gold, tin, etc., were discovered there long ago, and industry to mine and process minerals has been set up there.

In many African countries, large, typically colonial cities were built, where the colonizers lived a fabulous life. Now, on the one hand, the local great bourgeoisie and its wealth is growing and developing there, while on the other hand, the impoverishment of the broad masses of working people is increasing still more. In these countries a certain degree of cultural development has been achieved, but it has more of a European character. The local culture has not developed. It has generally remained at the stage reached by

the tribes and is not represented outside them, in the centres with towering sky-scrapers. This has come about because, outside the large centres, where the colonizers lived, stark misery and extreme poverty existed, hunger, disease, ignorance and ruthless exploitation of the people, in the full meaning of the term, reigned supreme.

The African population remained culturally and economically undeveloped and continuously diminished in numbers, declining because of colonial wars, the savage racial persecution, and the traffic in African negroes, who were sent to the metropolises, the United States of America, and other countries to work like animals in the plantations of cotton and other crops, as well as in the heaviest jobs in industry and construction.

For these reasons, the African peoples still have a great struggle ahead of them. This is and will be a very complicated struggle, differing from one country to another, because of the state of their economic, cultural and educational development, the degree of their political awakening, the great influence which the different religions, such as the Christian and Moslem religions, the old pagan beliefs, etc., exert on the masses of these peoples. This struggle becomes still more difficult since many of these countries are actually under the domination of neo-colonialism combined with that of local bourgeois-capitalist cliques. The law there is made by those powerful capitalist and

imperialist states which subsidize or control the ruling cliques, which they set up and remove whenever the interests of the neo-colonialists require or when the balance of these interests is upset.

The policy pursued by the big landowners, the reactionary bourgeoisie, the imperialists and the neo-colonialists is intended to keep the African peoples in permanent bondage, in ignorance, to hinder their social, political and ideological development, and to obstruct their struggle to gain these rights. At present we see that those same imperialists who used to lord it over these peoples in the past, as well as other new imperialists, are trying to penetrate into the African continent, by meddling in every way in the internal affairs of the peoples. As a result of this, the contradictions among imperialists, between the peoples and the bourgeois-capitalist leaderships of most of these countries, and between the peoples and the new colonizers, are becoming more and more severe every day.

These contradictions must be utilized by the peoples, both to deepen them and to benefit from them. But this can be achieved only through resolute struggle by the proletariat, the poor peasantry, by all the oppressed and the slaves, against imperialism and neo-colonialism, against the local big bourgeoisie, the big landowners and their whole establishment. A special role in this struggle

devolves upon progressives and democrats, the revolutionary youth and patriotic intellectuals, who aspire to see their own countries advancing free and independent, on the path of development and progress. Only through continuous and organized struggle by them will life be made difficult for the local and foreign oppressors and exploiters and government impossible. This situation will be prepared in the specific circumstances of each African state.

British and US imperialism have not given to the peoples of Africa any freedom. Everybody can see what is happening in South Africa, for instance. The white racists, the British capitalists, the exploiters, are ruling there, savagely oppressing the coloured peoples of that state, where the law of jungle prevails. Many other countries of Africa are dominated by the concerns and capital of the United States of America, Britain, France, Belgium, and other old colonialists and imperialists, who have become somewhat weaker, but who still hold the keys to the economies of these countries.

The peoples of Asia, too, have traversed a road full of suffering and hardship, ruthless imperialist oppression and exploitation. On the eve of the Second Word War, nine tenths of the population of this continent, Soviet Asia excluded, was in a state of colonial and semi-colonial oppres-

sion and exploitation by the imperialist powers of Europe, Japan and the United States of America. Great Britain alone, had colonies totalling 5 million 635 thousand square kilometres of territory with more than 420 million inhabitants in Asia. The colonial oppression and exploitation of the overwhelming majority of the countries of Asia had left them in a state of marked socio-economic and cultural backwardness and utter poverty. They served only as sources to supply the imperialist metropolises with raw materials such as oil, coal, chromium, manganese, magnesium, tin, rubber, etc.

After the war, the colonial order was shattered in Asia, too. Separate national states were set up in the colonial countries. Most of these countries won this victory through bloody war waged by the popular masses against the colonialists and the Japanese invaders.

The liberation war of the Chinese people, which led to the liberation of China from Japanese imperialist rule, the routing of the reactionary forces of Chiang Kai-shek and the triumph of the democratic revolution, was of special importance for the collapse of colonialism in Asia. For a time, this victory, in such a large country as China, exerted an extensive influence on the liberation struggle of the Asian peoples and the peoples of other countries dominated by, or dependent on, the imperialist powers. But this influence gra-

dually declined, because of the line followed by the Chinese leadership after the founding of the People's Republic of China.

The Chinese leadership proclaimed that China had set out on the road of socialist development. The revolutionaries and the freedom-loving peoples of the world, who wanted and expected China to become a powerful bastion of socialism and world revolution, ardently welcomed this proclamation. But their desires and hopes were not being fulfilled. Hard though it was for people to believe, the facts and the very troubled and confused situation which prevailed in China showed that it was not marching on the socialist road.

Meanwhile, the struggle of the Asian peoples had not ended with the destruction of colonialism. While being obliged to recognize the independence of the former colonial countries, the British, French, Dutch and other colonialists wanted to preserve their economic and political positions in these countries in order to continue their domination and exploitation in other, neo-colonialist forms. The penetration of the United States of America into Asia, especially the Far East, Southeast Asia and the islands of the Pacific, made the situation particularly serious. This region had and still has great economic and military-strategic importance for American imperialism. It established big military bases and deployed powerful fleets there. Parallel with this, US capital got the economies of the

countries of this area firmly into its blood-stained clutches. Meanwhile the US imperialists undertook large-scale military operations, diversionist and espionage activities to put down the national liberation movements of the Asian countries. They succeeded in dividing Korea and Vietnam in two, setting up reactionary, puppet regimes in the southern parts of both these countries. Pro-imperialist landowner-bourgeois regimes were established in many former colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia. In this way, the mediaeval slavery, the savage rule of maharajas, kings, sheiks, samurais, and «modernized» capitalist gentlemen was preserved there. These regimes sold their countries to the imperialists again, especially to US imperialism, thus immensely hindering the socio-economic and cultural development of these countries.

Under these conditions, the peoples of Asia, who were again languishing under the heavy imperialist and landowner-bourgeois yoke, could not lay down their arms, but had to continue their fight for liberation to get rid of this yoke. Generally, this struggle was led by the communist parties. Wherever these parties had succeeded in establishing sound links with the masses, making them conscious of the liberation aims of the war, and mobilizing and organizing them in revolutionary armed struggle, positive results were reached. The historic victory which the peoples of

Indochina, especially the Vietnamese people, won over the US imperialists and their local landowner-bourgeois stooges, showed the entire world that imperialism, even a superpower like the United States of America, with all its mighty economic and military potential, with all the modern means of war at its disposal, which it uses to put down the liberation movements, is unable to subjugate peoples and countries, whether big or small, when they are determined to make any sacrifice and fight selflessly to the finish for their freedom and independence.

Liberation armed struggles have been waged and are still going on in many other countries of Asia, like Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia and elsewhere. Had it not been for the anti-Marxist and chauvinist interference and stands of the Chinese leadership, which have brought about splits and disorientation among the revolutionary forces and the communist parties leading these forces, these struggles would certainly have scored greater successes and victories. On the one hand, the Chinese leaders proclaimed their support for the liberation wars in these countries, while on the other hand, they supported the reactionary regimes, welcomed and farewelled the chiefs of these regimes with paeans of praise and a thousand honours. They have always followed the strategy and tactic of subordinating the liberation movements of the Asian countries

to their pragmatic policy and hegemonic interests. They have always brought pressure to bear upon the revolutionary forces and their leadership in order to impose this policy on them. They have never been really concerned about the question of peoples' liberation and the revolution in the countries of Asia, but only about the realization of their chauvinist ambitions. They have not helped these peoples but have hindered them.

The question of the revolution and the liberation struggle in Asia has never demanded solution so forcibly and imperatively as it does now, it has never been more complicated and difficult to solve.

This complication and these difficulties have resulted mainly from the aims and activities of the American imperialists, as well as from the anti-Marxist, anti-popular, hegemonic and expansionist aims and activities of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists and social-imperialists.

The United States of America is aiming and striving with might and main to preserve and strengthen its strategic, economic and military positions in Asia, for it considers these positions of vital importance to its imperialist interests.

The Soviet Union, too, is aiming and striving by all means and with all forces to expand the positions it has already occupied in Asia.

China, on its part, has openly displayed its pretension to become the ruler of Asian countries,

by forming alliances, to this end, with the United States of America, and especially with Japan, and directly opposing the Soviet Union.

Japan, also, has the ambition to dominate Asia, the old ambition of Japanese imperialism.

That is why the Soviet Union is so greatly afraid of the Sino-Japanese alliance and is opposing it so strongly. But neither does American imperialism want this alliance to become so solid that it goes beyond the limits which might infringe American interests, although it encouraged and gave its «blessing» to the signing of the treaty between China and Japan, from the standpoint that this treaty might contain the Soviet expansion which is to the detriment of American domination.

India, which is a big country, also, has ambitions of becoming a great power with the atomic bombs and great weight in Asia, of playing a special role, in particular concerning the strategic position it has at the nodal point of the expansionist interests of the two imperialist superpowers, American and Soviet, in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and on its northern and eastern borders.

British imperialism has not given up its aim of domination in the Asian countries, either. And certain other capitalist-imperialist states also have similar aims.

That is why Asia has become one of the areas

of the fiercest inter-imperialist rivalries today, and consequently, many dangerous hotbeds of world conflagrations, for which the peoples will pay the price, have been created there.

In order to quell the revolutions and the liberation struggle in the countries of Asia and open the way to the realization of their hegemonic and expansionist plans, the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, in feverish competition with each other, have been and are engaged in a very filthy job of splitting and destroying the ranks of the communist parties and the revolutionary and freedom-loving forces of these countries. This activity was one of the main causes of the catastrophe suffered by the Communist Party of Indonesia, and of the splitting and destruction of the Communist Party of India, etc. They advocate the alliance and unity of the proletariat and the broad popular masses with the local reactionary bourgeoisie, while each of them is trying to win the friendship of this ruling bourgeoisie, for its own ends.

The interference of the Soviet and Chinese social-imperialists in the various countries of Asia from their hegemonic and expansionist positions and ambitions has faced the liberation movements of these peoples with great dangers and has even put the victories of the liberation war in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos directly in jeopardy.

The revolutionary and freedom-loving forces of the Asian countries, which are led by the

Marxist-Leninist communist parties, have to face up to and eliminate both the danger from local reaction, which is armed by its imperialist patrons, and the dangers from the splitting and disruptive activities, and the hegemonic and expansionist plans of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists. They also have to free themselves from a series of old reactionary, mystical, Buddhist, Brahmanic and other religious ideas and concepts, which hold back the liberation movement. They also have to prevent «new» reactionary ideas and concepts from striking root, such as the revisionist ideas of Khrushchevism, Maoism, and other just as reactionary theories, which disorientate and deceive the masses, deprive them of their militant class spirit, and lead them into wrong and hopeless paths.

The liberation struggle ahead of the peoples of Asia is truly difficult and has many obstacles indeed, but there never has been, and never will be, an easy liberation struggle or revolution, without great difficulties and obstacles that must be overcome, which do not require bloodshed and many sacrifices to achieve ultimate victory.

The countries of Latin America, in general, have a higher level of capitalist development than the countries of Africa and Asia. But the degree of dependence of the Latin-American countries on foreign capital is not lower than that of the

overwhelming majority of African and Asian countries.

Unlike the African and Asian countries, most of the countries in Latin America proclaimed themselves independent states much earlier, since the first half of the 19th century, as a result of the liberation struggles of the peoples of that continent against the Spanish and Portuguese colonizers. Had these countries not fallen under another yoke, the semi-colonial yoke of British, French, German, American and other foreign capital, right after they shook off the Spanish or Portuguese colonial yoke, they would have made much greater progress. Up to the beginning of this century the British colonialists were the masters of the situation on this continent. They plundered colossal amounts of raw materials from these countries, built ports, railways, power stations in the exclusive service of their concessionary companies, and traded there industrial goods produced in Britain.

This situation changed, but not in favour of the Latin-American peoples, with the penetration of Latin America by the United States of America at the stage of its imperialist development. The imperialism of the United States of America used the slogan «America for Americans», embodied in the «Monroe doctrine», in order to establish its undivided domination over the whole Western hemisphere. The economic penetration of the

United States of America into this hemisphere was carried out both by means of military force and political blackmail and by dollar diplomacy, by means of the stick and the carrot. Thus in 1930, investments of American and British capital in Latin America were equal, whereas after the Second World War, the United States of America became the real master of the economy of this region of the globe. Its big monopolies took control of the key branches of the economy in Latin America. The countries of that continent became part of the «invisible» empire of American imperialism, which began to make the law in all of them, to appoint and dismiss the heads of state and the governments, to dictate their internal and external economic and military policies.

The monopoly companies of the United States of America drew fabulous profits from the exploitation of the rich natural resources and the toil, sweat and blood of the Latin-American peoples: for each dollar invested in the various countries of this continent they took 4-5 dollars profit. This situation still prevails to this day.

Although the capital investments by the imperialist states in Latin America led to the setting up of some modern industry, particularly the extracting industry as well as light and food processing industry, these investments have been a very great hindrance to the general economic development of the Latin-American countries. The

foreign monopolies and the neo-colonialist policy of the imperialist states have given the economic development of these countries a distorted, one-sided form, a mono-cultural character, turning them simply into specialized suppliers of raw materials: Venezuela — oil, Bolivia — tin, Chile — copper, Brazil and Colombia — coffee, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic — sugar, Uruguay and Argentina — livestock products, Ecuador — bananas, and so on.

This one-sided character made the economy of these countries utterly unstable, utterly incapable of rapid and all-round development, completely at the mercy of the changes and fluctuation of prices on the capitalist world market, Any decline in production and any manifestation of economic crisis in the United States of America and the other capitalist countries was bound to be reflected negatively, indeed even more drastically, in the economies of the countries of Latin America, too.

After the Second World War, the imperialist metropolises began to make direct large-scale investments in the various branches of industry, mining, farming, to buy up national enterprises, etc. They extended their domination over whole sectors of production, and stepped up the plunder of the countries of Latin America to the maximum. At the same time, they encouraged provision of loans and financing at high interest rates,

thus binding these countries even more tightly to the foreign domination and to the domination of the United States of America, first of all. Brazil alone has debts to the foreign banks amounting to almost 40 billion dollars and Mexico nearly 30 billion dollars.

Capitalist development in Latin America has remained generally backward also because there are still many survivals of the latifundia which have not completely lost their feudal character, that is why in some of the Latin-American countries there is very marked backwardness, as in those of Asia and Africa. In the countries of Latin America an oligarchy, a very powerful monopoly big bourgeoisie dependent on imperialist economic policy and direct imperialist interference, has been created, which together with the big landowners has state power in its hands and, always with the support of American imperialism and together with it, ruthlessly oppresses and exploits the working class, the peasantry and the other strata of working people who live in abject poverty.

This development has also created quite a large industrial proletariat which, together with the agricultural proletariat and the building and services workers, makes up nearly half the population, unlike Africa and Asia where, in most countries, the working class is very small.

Besides this, in Latin America the peasantry

and the working class, which has emerged from its ranks, have a rich militant revolutionary tradition gained in the ceaseless struggles for freedom, land, work and bread, a tradition which has been developed further in the battles against the local oligarchy and foreign monopolies, against American imperialism. The peoples of Latin America rank among the peoples who have fought and shed their blood the most against their internal and external oppressors and exploiters. In these battles they have had more than a few victories, and not minor ones either, but the complete victory of democratic freedoms, the wiping out of exploitation, securing national independence and sovereignty, has still not been won in any Latin-American country. The Latin-American peoples cherished many hopes, had many illusions, about the victory of the Cuban people, which became an inspiration and encouragement to them in their struggle to shake off the yoke of the local capitalist and landowner rulers and American imperialists. However, these hopes and this inspiration soon faded when they saw that Castroite Cuba was not developing on the road of socialism but on that of revisionist-type capitalism, and faded even more quickly when Cuba became the vassal and mercenary of Soviet social-imperialism.

In Latin America today, as on all continents, the situation is complicated.

In most of these countries the situation is

revolutionary and puts the revolution for the overthrow of the bourgeois-landowner order and the liquidation of imperialist dependence on the order of the day. Of course, these revolutions cannot have the same character, the same process of development and the same solution everywhere, for the known reasons of the particular conditions and problems of each country or group of countries, the different levels of their socio-economic development, their dependence on imperialism or social-imperialism, the more or less moderate, or more or less fascist, bourgeois regimes, etc. But one thing is obviously essential — the interlinking, more closely than in many countries of Africa and Asia, of the anti-imperialist, democratic and socialist tasks of the revolution.

Latin America also has many advantages in regard to the preparation of the subjective factor of the revolution, because of the relatively high level of consciousness and readiness of the broad popular masses to fight against the internal and foreign oppression and exploitation, for freedom, democracy and socialism. However, it is not just the imperialists, especially the Americans, together with local reaction, but also the local revisionists and the other opportunist stooges of capitalism, as well as the Soviet and Chinese revisionists, who are obstructing, confusing, and fighting with all their strength against the full preparation of this factor.

Sticking to its policy of keeping Latin America as its exclusive domain, from which it extracts colossal superprofits, American imperialism is manoeuvring with all its means — military force, secret agents, demagogy and deception, to prevent any other imperialism from predominating there, to ensure that the revolution will not break out and triumph in any of these countries. Thus it wants to preserve both the total dependence of the Latin-American countries on the United States of America and the bourgeois-landowner order in these countries.

An important weapon in the hands of the United States of America to this end is the so-called Organization of American States, which is under the command of the president, the Pentagon and the State Department of the United States. The Constitution of this organization gives the United States the right to intervene in any way and with any means, even military means, to maintain the status quo, both internal and external, of the countries of Latin America.

Meanwhile, the big American monopolies have perfected their method of exploitation in these countries by organizing the multi-national monopoly companies which have their centres in, and are controlled by, the United States of America, and by making large use of state capitalism, by means of which they also secure their control over

the local governments and state apparatus in general.

But these and many other means the United States of America employs do not solve the problems arising from the grave economic and political crisis which has the Latin-American countries also in its grip.

Now that the local capitalists and landowners cannot exist without being dependent on, or having the support of, American imperialism, the idea of the revolution, as the only and indispensable means to gain national and social liberation, is becoming ever more deeply and widely implanted in the consciousness of the proletariat, the working peasantry, the progressive intelligentsia, and the masses of the youth of these countries.

In order to avert the revolutions, the American imperialists and the local capitalists resort to two main methods. One is to establish military-fascist regimes through a «pronunciamento militar» (military putsch) when they see that their positions are more immediately threatened. This is what they did in Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Bolivia and elsewhere. The other method is to organize democratic-bourgeois regimes with marked limitations and large gaps in fundamental freedoms, as in Venezuela, Mexico, or as they are doing now in Brazil, trying, in this manner, to ease the revolutionary tensions and give the impression that the bourgeoisie of these countries and, to an even

greater extent, the administration of the United States of America and its president are allegedly concerned about «human rights».

However, such means and manoeuvres cannot solve the problems of the crisis, cannot avert revolutionary situations, cannot wipe the revolution off the agenda.

The proletariat and all the revolutionary forces in the Latin-American countries are faced with very important revolutionary tasks. In order to perform such tasks, that is, to carry out the revolution, to win their complete national independence, to establish democratic freedoms and socialism, they have to fight in many directions, against the local bourgeois and latifundist oligarchy, against US imperialism, as well as against various lackeys of capital, imperialism and social-imperialism, such as the pro-Soviet and Castroite revisionists, the pro-Chinese revisionists, the Trotskyites, etc. They must not only cope with the diversionist and splitting activity of various shades of opportunists and revisionists, but also free themselves from petty-bourgeois influences such as expressed by a number of putschist, foquist, adventurist concepts and practices which have become a kind of tradition, but which have nothing in common with the true revolution, and on the contrary, cause it great damage. However, this question requires careful handling.

In regard to the militant tradition of the

peoples of Latin America the positive, revolutionary aspect is predominant. It constitutes a very important factor that must be used to the best advantage and as widely as possible in the preparation and development of the revolution while giving the tradition a new content, free from the negative pistolero and foquist elements.

The Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class will play a decisive role in carrying out these great tasks. Now, not only have such parties been created in almost every country of Latin America, but most of them have taken important steps forward in the work of preparing the proletariat and the masses of the people for revolution. In irreconcilable struggle against the revisionists and other opportunists, against all the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Castroite, Khrushchevite, Trotskyite, «three worlds», and other such views and practices, they have worked out a correct political line and accumulated sufficient experience in the struggle to put this line into practice, becoming the bearers of all the revolutionary tradition of the past, in order to use it and develop it further to the advantage of the workers' and liberation movement, the preparation and raising of the masses in revolution.

The revolutionary situations existing today make it essential for these parties to maintain the closest possible contacts and consult with one another as frequently as possible, to be able to gain

the maximum benefits from one another's experience and co-ordinate their stands and actions on the common problems of the struggle against the reactionary bourgeoisie and imperialism, against Soviet, Chinese and other brands of modern revisionism, and on all the problems of the revolution.

Now that the peoples have awakened and refuse to live any longer under the imperialist and colonial yoke, now that they are demanding freedom, independence, development and progress, and are seething with anger against foreign and internal oppressors, now that Africa, Latin America and Asia have become a boiling cauldron, the old and new colonialists are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to dominate and exploit the peoples of these countries by means of the previous methods and forms. They are quite unable to do without their plunder and exploitation of the wealth, the toil and the blood of these peoples.

That is why all these efforts are being made to find new methods and forms of deception, plunder and exploitation, to dispense some alms, which, again, do not benefit the masses, but the bourgeois-landowner ruling classes.

Meanwhile the question has been made even more complicated, because Soviet social-imperialism long ago began to penetrate and entrench itself more and more deeply in the former colonies and semi-colonies, and because social-imperialist

China has begun to make feverish efforts to get in there, too.

The revisionist Soviet Union carries out its expansionist interference under the guise of its allegedly Leninist policy of aid for the peoples' liberation struggle, posing as the natural ally of these countries and peoples. As a means to penetrate into Africa and elsewhere, the Soviet revisionists employ and spread slogans of a socialist colour in order to deceive the peoples who aspire to liberate themselves, to liquidate oppression and exploitation, and who know that the only road to complete national and social liberation is socialism.

The Soviet Union also involves its allies, or better, its satellites in its interference. We are seeing this concretely in Africa, where the Soviet social-imperialists and their Cuban mercenaries are intervening on the pretext that they are assisting the revolution. This is a lie. Their intervention is nothing but a colonialist action aimed at capturing markets and subjugating peoples.

The intervention of the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries in Angola is of this nature. They have never had the slightest intention of assisting the Angolan revolution, but their aim was and is to get their claws into that African country which had won a certain independence after the expulsion of the Portuguese colonialists. The Cuban mercenaries are the colonial army dispatched by the Soviet Union to capture markets and stra-

tegic positions in the countries of Black Africa, and to go on from Angola to other states, to enable the Soviet social-imperialists, too, to create a modern colonial empire.

Under the cloak of aid for peoples' liberation the Soviet Union and its mercenary, Cuba, are intervening in other countries with armies equipped with artillery and machine-guns, allegedly to build socialism, which does not exist in either the Soviet Union or Cuba. These two bourgeois-revisionist states intervened in Angola in order to help a capitalist clique seize power, contrary to the aims of the Angolan people who had fought to win their freedom from the Portuguese colonialists. Agostinho Neto is playing the game of the Soviets. In the struggle against the other faction, in order to seize power for himself, he called in the Soviets to help him. The struggle between the two opposing Angolan clans did not have anything of a people's revolutionary character. The fight between them was a struggle of cliques for power. Each of them was supported by different imperialist states. Agostinho Neto emerged the winner from this contest, while socialism did not triumph in Angola. On the contrary, following the intervention from abroad, Soviet neo-colonialism has been established there.

Social-imperialist China, too, is making great efforts to penetrate into the former colonial and semi-colonial countries.

An example of how China intervenes is provided by Zaire, a country ruled by the clique around Mobutu, the wealthiest and most blood-thirsty clique on the African continent. In the fighting which flared up in Zaire recently, the Moroccans of the Sherifian Kingdom of Morocco, the French air force, and China, too, all rushed to the aid of Mobutu, the murderer of Patrice Lumumba. The assistance given by the French is understandable, because with their intervention they were defending their concessions and concerns in Katanga, and at the same time, protecting their men, as well as Mobutu and his clique. But what do the Chinese revisionists want in Katanga? Whom are they assisting there? Are they helping the people of Zaire who are being suppressed by Mobutu and his clique and by the French, Belgian, US and other concession holders? Or are not they, too, assisting the blood-thirsty Mobutu clique? The fact is that the Chinese revisionist leadership is assisting this clique not indirectly, but quite openly. To make this assistance more concrete and more demonstrative, it sent its foreign minister, Huang Hua there, as well as military experts and military and economic aid. Thus, it acted in an anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary way. China's interference has exactly the same features as that of King Hassan of Morocco and that of France.

The Chinese social-imperialists are interfering not only in the affairs of that country, but also in other affairs of the peoples and countries of Africa and other continents, especially in those countries into which they are striving to penetrate in every way, in order to establish economic, political and strategic bases there.

Even the United States of America dare not assist Pinochet, the fascist hangman of Chile, so openly as China is doing. Indeed, the Americans do not assist the reactionary rulers of other countries in this way, even although they have great interests at stake there. This does not mean that the US imperialists are renouncing their own interests. They do defend these interests, defend them very strongly, but in more subtle ways.

With the stand it is maintaining, the so-called socialist China is going against the interests and aspirations of the peoples, the communists, the revolutionary elements, against the aspirations of all the progressive people of Latin America.

China is taking under its protection the various dictators who are ruling the peoples and, with terror and any other means, are suppressing the efforts of revolutionaries, the proletariat and the Marxist-Leninist parties that are fighting for national and social liberation. With such stands, it has taken the road of counter-revolution. Under the guise of Marxism-Leninism it is trying to show that it is allegedly exporting the idea of the

revolution to various countries, but in fact, China is exporting the idea of the counter-revolution. In this way it is helping US imperialism and the fascist cliques in power.

The imperialist or social-imperialist powers are striving to the same extent to prevent the African, Asian, or Latin-American peoples from developing their revolutionary struggle stage by stage, against the oppression and savage exploitation by their leaderships and the imperialists, who are ruling in agreement with them and sucking their blood.

The duty of revolutionaries, progressives, and patriots in the countries with a low level of socio-economic development and dependent on the imperialist and social-imperialist powers is to make the peoples conscious of this oppression and exploitation, to educate, mobilize and organize them and hurl them into the liberation struggle, always bearing in mind that it is the broad masses, the peoples, that carry out the revolution. To this end it is necessary to make thorough analyses of the internal and external situation in each country, of its socio-economic development, the ratio of class forces, the antagonisms among classes, and the antagonisms between the people and the reactionary cliques in power, as well as between the people and the imperialist states. On this basis correct conclusions can be drawn about the step which must be taken and the tactics which must be employed. What is required from the rev-

olutionary forces is intensive work, determination and wisdom, and first and foremost, thorough understanding of the fact that the liberation struggle in their countries can achieve true victory only by linking this struggle with the cause of the proletariat, the cause of socialism.

Therefore, the proletariat in each country must create its own revolutionary party, which must be capable of applying the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin faithfully, linking them closely with the conditions of each country, with the situation of each individual people. It is absolutely essential that each of these parties has a profound knowledge of the mentality of the masses and the economic, political, ideological and cultural development of its country, and does not act in a capricious and adventurist way, in a Blanquist way, but fights persistently to rally round itself the allies of the proletariat, the broad masses of the people.

The revolutionaries and the masses of the people need to prepare themselves persistently, bearing in mind the activities of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners in power, and the foreign oppressors, as well as the intrigues of neo-colonialists. These are important factors, which the revolutionary elements and the peoples must face up to with maturity, with sound organization and revolutionary tactics.

Naturally, not only are ties of co-operation,

co-ordination and exchange of experience not excluded, but it is essential to establish them between the revolutionary forces and elements of various countries. This is made easier because they have many similar conditions, such as oppression and exploitation by neo-colonialism and the reactionary bourgeoisie, and a common culture, as well as the common goal of liberation from this oppression and exploitation. The conditions and interests they have in common impel the revolutionary and progressive elements of all these countries to hold consultations, to develop cooperation and coordination in their activities, with which they counter the actions of the enemies who oppress them.

Viewing the situation of the peoples languishing under neo-colonialist domination from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, the task facing all genuine revolutionaries is to give the revolutionary and liberation struggle of these peoples unreserved support and backing, so that it advances consistently and the revolution builds up ceaselessly, to its complete victory.

Genuine Revolutionaries Call on the Proletarians and Peoples to Rise up for the New World, the Socialist World

As we explained in the foregoing, the general crisis of capitalism is growing ever deeper. As a result, the proletariat, the oppressed classes

and peoples are refusing to endure the exploitation any longer, demanding a change in their lives, demanding the overthrow of the bourgeois order, the abolition of neo-colonialism and imperialism. But these aspirations can be realized only through the revolution. No victory can be achieved without clashing with, and attacking, the internal and external class enemies.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class, as the leaders of the revolution, make the proletariat, the toiling masses, and the peoples conscious and prepare them politically, ideologically and militarily for these clashes.

The Marxist-Leninist parties, all revolutionaries, however few in numbers, establish themselves among the people, organize the masses systematically, with great care and patience, convince them that they are a great force, that they are able to overthrow capital, to seize state power and wield it in the interest of the proletariat and the people. Such parties do not think that, being small, they cannot stand up to the coalition of the parties of the bourgeoisie and the opinion formed by them. The task of the revolutionaries is to prove to the broad masses of the people that this opinion created by the bourgeoisie is wrong, that it must be demolished and that the true revolutionary opinion, which represents a great transforming force, must be formed.

To carry out their mission successfully, the

Marxist-Leninist parties consider that, first of all, they must have a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line, which must respond to the interests and aspirations of the broad popular masses, and the revolutionary solution to the problems and tasks which the struggle to destroy the bourgeois order and the foreign imperialist domination presents.

Marxism-Leninism is the only science which gives the revolutionary party of the working class the possibility to work out a correct political line, to define the strategic aim and tasks clearly, and apply revolutionary tactics and methods for their realization.

Enlightened by Marxism-Leninism and in conformity with the concrete socio-economic and political conditions of the country and the international circumstances, the Marxist-Leninist party knows how to orientate itself and stand at the head of the masses at any time and at every stage of the revolution, be it a democratic, national liberation, or socialist revolution. A revolutionary strategy and a correct political line based on Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary practice of the world proletariat and the class struggles of its own country, makes it possible to clearly define the strategic aim at the given stage, to determine who are the chief internal and external enemies against whom the main blow should be struck,

who the internal and external allies of the proletariat are, etc.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have as their aim the overthrow of the capitalist order and the triumph of socialism, whereas, when the revolution in their country is confronted with tasks of a democratic and anti-imperialist character, they aim to develop it unceasingly, to raise it to a socialist revolution, to go over as quickly as possible to the fulfilment of socialist tasks.

Both the strategic aim of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the roads to achieve it are totally different from those of the false communist and workers' parties. The former cannot conceive of achieving this aim except by overturning the capitalist relations of production and destroying the old state apparatus, the whole bourgeois superstructure, to its foundations. They adhere to the teachings of Lenin who says,

> «*The essence of the revolution is that the proletariat* **destroys** *the 'administrative apparatus' and the* **entire** *state apparatus, replacing it with a new apparatus comprised of the armed workers*».*

The latter preach the preservation of the old state apparatus, though in words they claim that they

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 25, p. 577 (Alb. ed.).

stand for socialism. According to them, socialism can be established through reforms, through the parliamentary road, even by using the old state machine.

A number of so-called communist parties are now proving to be even more zealous than the declared bourgeois parties in their defence of the existing capitalist order. For instance, the revisionist party of Ibarruri-Carillo brazenly defends the monarchic regime of Juan Carlos, at a time when some Spanish bourgeois parties are demanding its replacement with a republican regime. Likewise, the revisionist party of Berlinguer comes out as a fervent champion of the oppressive laws of the Italian capitalist state, which are aimed against democratic freedoms, at a time when various bourgeois parties are not doing this openly. The Chinese revisionists, for their part, instruct the parties which follow the Chinese line in the capitalist countries that they must fight together with the most militarist circles to strengthen the armies and the bourgeois apparatus of violence, allegedly to defend the homeland, but in reality to suppress the revolution, if it should break out.

In their aims to undermine the revolutionary and liberation movement and to perpetuate capitalism and imperialist domination, the bourgeoisie and its followers, especially the modern revisionists, are trying by all manner of means to confuse

and split the revolutionary forces while erasing the distinction between the friends and the enemies of the revolution. Typical of this are the preachings of the Chinese revisionists who present the big monopoly bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist regimes, NATO and the European Common Market, and even American imperialism, as allies of the proletariat and the oppressed peoples.

As for the Marxist-Leninist parties, they consider that an absolutely essential condition for building a genuinely revolutionary strategy is the establishment of a clear-cut dividing line between the motive forces of the revolution and its enemies and a clear definition of the main internal and external enemy against whom, as Stalin pointed out, the main blow must be aimed, without underrating and overlooking the fight against the other enemies.

In our time, in the conditions of imperialism, the main internal enemy of the revolution, not only in the developed capitalist countries, but also in the oppressed and dependent countries, is the local big bourgeoisie which stands at the head of the capitalist order and fights with all its means, with violence and oppression, demagogy and deceit, to preserve its domination and privileges, to smother and extinguish any movement of the working people which jeopardizes its state power and class interests in the slightest degree. On the other hand, in the actual conditions, the

main external enemy of the revolution and the peoples is world imperialism, the imperialist superpowers, in particular. To advise and call on the proletariat and the oppressed peoples to rely on one superpower to fight the other, or to enter into alliance with the imperialist powers for the sake of allegedly defending national freedom and independence, as the Chinese revisionists advocate, is nothing but betrayal of the cause of the revolution.

The revisionists have made **the hegemonic role of the working class in revolution, which constitutes one of the fundamental questions of the revolutionary strategy,** their special target.

> «*The main thing in the doctrine of Marx,*» wrote Lenin, «*is the explanation of the world historic role of the proletariat, as the creator of socialist society*»*.

Lenin described the negation of the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement as the most vulgar expression of reformism.

Among the modern revisionists, some strive to prove that the working class is allegedly being deproletarianized and transformed into «co-manager» of enterprises, hence there is no longer a

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol, 18, p. 651 (Alb. ed.).

place for the proletarian revolution, no need for a social order different from the existing one. Others claim that not only the workers, but everybody engaged in work and cultural activities, all wage and salary earners are now proletarians, and that not only the working class, but also other classes and strata of the society are interested in socialism. Therefore, they conclude, the hegemonic role of the working class in the revolutionary movement today has lost its meaning. The Soviet revisionists do not deny the leading role of the working class in words, while they have liquidated it in practice, because they have deprived this class of any possibility to lead. But even in theory they eliminate this role, in as much as they defend the ill-famed theory of «the party and state of the entire people». The Chinese revisionists, as the pragmatists they are, sometimes put the peasantry, sometimes the army, sometimes the pupils and students, etc., which ever suits the occasion, at the head of the «revolution».

The Party of Labour of Albania resolutely defends the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the working class constitutes the decisive force in the development of society, the leading force for the revolutionary transformation of the world, for the construction of socialist and communist society.

The working class remains the main productive force of society, the most advanced class, the class more interested than any other in national

and social liberation, in socialism, and is the bearer of the finest traditions of revolutionary organization and struggle. It has the only scientific theory for the revolutionary transformation of society and its own militant Marxist-Leninist party which guide it towards this goal. Objectively history has charged it with the mission of leading the entire struggle for the transition from capitalism to communism.

The hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution is decisive for the solution of the fundamental question of the revolution, the question of political power, in its own favour and that of the masses of the people.

The new power may pass through different phases and may be given various names, in keeping with the concrete conditions in which the revolution is carried out and the various stages it may go through, but there can be no development of the revolution towards the triumph of socialism without the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches us this, and the experience of all triumphant socialist revolutions also demonstrates it. Therefore, whatever the circumstances in which the revolution may be carried out, the Marxist-Leninist party never renounces its aim of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All the revisionists of various hues and trends without exception, in one way or another, deny

the need to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, because they are against the revolution, because they stand for the preservation and perpetuation of the capitalist order.

The proletariat with its Marxist-Leninist party goes into battle together with its allies. This, too, is one of the most important questions of the revolutionary strategy.

The natural and close ally of the proletariat is the poor peasantry, which is linked with it not just by the immediate strategic aim but also by the distant and ultimate strategic aim. Such allies are the poor strata of the urban working people too. The proletariat, together with the poor peasantry and the other oppressed and exploited working people, constitute the main motive forces of the revolution.

The urban petty-bourgeoisie also, which is constantly in the grip of big capital and under threat of total expropriation, can and should become an ally.

The proletariat also tries and struggles to make allies of other strata of the population, such as the progressive section of the intelligentsia, which is exploited by internal and foreign capital. The weight of the intelligentsia has increased in capitalist and revisionist countries. But despite all the changes its position, character and the role of

its work have undergone, it does not and never can constitute a class in itself, and neither is it nor can it be merged with the working class, as various revisionists claim. Therefore, as Lenin has shown and history has proved, the intelligentsia cannot be an independent socio-political force. Its role and place in society are determined by its socio-economic position and ideological and political convictions. No matter how much this position and these convictions may change, the intelligentsia can never replace the working class in its role of leading the revolution. The task of the proletariat is to win the progressive section of the intelligentsia over to its side, to convince it of the inevitability of the collapse of the capitalist system and the triumph of socialism, and make it an ally in the revolution.

In the countries of Africa, Latin America, Asia, etc., with little socio-economic development and more dependent on foreign capital, and where the democratic and anti-imperialist tasks of the revolution have special importance, the middle peasantry and that section of the bourgeoisie which is not linked with foreign capital and which aspires to an independent development of the country, can also be allies of the proletariat.

The uniting of this section of the bourgeoisie with the democratic and anti-imperialist revolution depends on the correct strategy and tactics of the proletariat, the skilful and intelligent man-

oeuvring of the revolutionary party of the working class. In this way, the proletariat with its party can convince not only the petty-bourgeoisie, but also this bourgeoisie, to place itself under the leadership of the proletariat and rise to abolish the foreign domination and liquidate the savage capitalist big bourgeoisie, a tool of imperialism — which oppresses and exploits the people, demoralizes them and corrupts their pure feelings, and centuries-old culture.

To win over the other classes and strata which are interested in achieving the strategic aim at a given stage of the revolution as its allies, the proletariat has to do battle with the big bourgeoisie and the other reactionaries, as over every other issue.

Foreseeing their defeat, the reactionary bourgeoisie and the big landowners make a thousand attempts and manoeuvres to draw the petty-bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia to their side, and to prevent them from becoming allies of the proletariat. They even try to deceive the working class itself, so that the revolution will not break out and, if it does, to ensure that it will not be carried through to the end, but will become bogged down or make an about-turn.

For their part, the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist party, work for and have all the possibilities to achieve unity of their allies around

themselves against the common enemies, such as the big bourgeoisie, the big landowners, the imperialists and social-imperialists, and to prevent the strata of the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie from becoming a reserve of big capital or the fascist dictatorship, as occurred in the time of Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, and Franco in the Spanish War.

The Marxist-Leninist party maintains a cautious and flexible attitude, especially towards its wavering, possible, or temporary allies, including the various strata of the middle bourgeoisie, which are linked by numerous threads, various interests, traditions and prejudices with the world of capital and imperialism. The proletariat and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party, without ever budging from their principled positions, are interested in attracting such forces, too, in spite of their waverings and instability, to the side of the revolution or the liberation struggle, or at least in neutralizing them, so that they do not become a reserve of the enemy.

The laws of the revolution operate in the countries where the revisionists are in power also, as everywhere else. What is the position of the new bourgeoisie that is developing in the revisionist countries of Europe? It aspires to free itself from the all-round, savage oppression of the Soviet bourgeoisie, from Soviet social-imperialism, but the two sides have fundamental interests in

common. The bourgeoisie of these countries could not exist apart from the Soviet bourgeoisie. And even if it were to detach itself from this savage social-imperialist big bourgeoisie, there is no doubt that it would soon come under the domination of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism.

As well as this, in the revisionist countries which are being economically, politically and militarily integrated into the great Soviet social-imperialist state, other strata of the population, besides the proletariat, are discontented because of the exploitation they are subjected to by the new bourgeoisie and the domination by Soviet social-imperialism. For this reason they hate both their own ruling bourgeoisie and Russian hegemonism and neo-colonialism. The proletariat of these countries needs to be awakened and made conscious of the historical necessity of coming out once again on the battlefield, of hurling itself into the fight to overthrow and rout the traitors in order to carry out the proletarian revolution again, to re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. It must create its new Marxist-Leninist parties and unite all the popular masses around itself.

While adhering consistently to the principle that the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution is the internal one, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the people of the

country themselves, whereas the external factor is of an auxiliary and secondary nature, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not ignore or underrate in the least the external allies of the revolution. At the same time, they take a principled and flexible stand towards the external allies, just as they do towards the internal allies.

In accordance with the teachings of Lenin and Stalin and basing themselves on the existing conditions, they see the proletariat and its revolutionary movement in other countries, the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement of the oppressed peoples of the world and the genuinely socialist countries as the natural and reliable external allies of the revolutionary movement in each country.

In particular cases, circumstances can also be created in which a socialist country, or a people fighting imperialist or social-imperialist aggression, may find themselves on a common front even with various countries of the capitalist world which also are fighting the same enemy, as occurred in the period of the Second World War.

In such cases, it is of first-rate importance to ensure that the interests of the revolution are always kept in mind, are never forgotten, obscured or sacrificed for the sake of the common front or alliance with these temporary allies, to ensure that this front or alliance is not transformed into an aim in itself. It is especially important not to

allow such allies to intervene to sabotage the revolution and to wrest the victory from it. The experience of the Communist Party of Albania in its stand towards the American and British allies in the years of the Anti-fascist National-Liberation War is significant. This stand was salutary for the fate of the revolution in Albania.

The revolutionary strategy is indivisible from the revolutionary tactics employed by the Marxist-Leninist parties to achieve the aim and to fulfil the tasks of the revolution. While being part of strategy and in its service, tactics may change according to the ebb and flow of the revolutionary tide, the concrete circumstances and conditions, but always within the limits of the revolutionary strategy and Marxist-Leninist principles.

> «*The task of tactical leadership,*» says Stalin, «*is to master all forms of struggle and organization of the proletariat and to ensure that they are used properly so as to achieve with the given relation of forces the maximum result necessary to prepare for strategic success*»*.

While adopting skilful tactics and forms of struggle to carry forward the cause of the revolu-

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 164 (Alb. ed.).

tion, the true Marxist-Leninist parties always loyally uphold revolutionary principles. They reject and combat any tendency to abandon principles for the sake of tactics, they are the most resolute opponents of any unprincipled pragmatic policy based on passing circumstances, which characterizes the entire activity of revisionists of all trends.

The revolution is always the deed of the masses led by the revolutionary vanguard. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party cannot fail to devote great attention to the revolutionary organization of the masses in appropriate forms, proceeding from the concrete conditions and circumstances, the traditions existing in each country, etc. Without organized links of the party with the masses it is idle even to talk of raising, preparing and mobilizing them in revolutionary struggle.

Precisely for this reason the Marxist-Leninist party attaches great importance to the creation of organizations of the masses under its leadership. Certainly, this is not a question which is solved easily, especially today, when many kinds of trade-union, co-operativist, cultural, scientific, youth, women's and other organizations exist in all the capitalist and revisionist countries. Most of these organizations are under the leadership and influence of the bourgeoisie, revisionists and the church.

However, as Lenin teaches us, the communists must get in and work wherever the mas-

ses are. Therefore they cannot fail to work also in the mass organizations led or influenced by the bourgeoisie, social-democrats, revisionists, etc. The Marxist-Leninists work in them to undermine the influence and leadership of the bourgeois and reformist parties, to spread the influence of the revolutionary party of the working class among the masses, to expose the fraudulent character of the programs and activity of the chiefs of these organizations, and to give the activities of the masses an anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, anti-revisionist political character. Through the revolutionary work they carry out in the ranks of the masses, revolutionary factions can also be formed within these organizations, indeed the possibilities may be created to take over the leadership of these organizations and to set them on a correct course.

But in any case the Marxist-Leninist party never gives up the aim of setting up revolutionary organizations of the masses under its leadership.

The most important organizations of the masses are the trade-unions. Generally speaking, in the capitalist and revisionist countries today, these organizations serve the bourgeoisie, revisionism, to keep the proletariat and all the working masses in bondage. In his time, Engels said that the trade-unions in Britain had been transformed from organizations which terrified the bourgeoisie into

organizations which served capital. The trade-union organizations have bound the worker with a thousand threads, with a thousand coils of the chain of enslavement, so that when the isolated worker revolts, he can easily be suppressed. The opportunist trade-union leaders work so that the revolts of the workers of one or more enterprises, who go on strike or hold demonstrations, are kept under control and assume only an economic character. The worker aristocracy works very hard to manipulate things in this direction. In the capitalist countries, this aristocracy plays a major role in eroding, suppressing, and misleading the revolt of the masses and has long become a fire brigade to quell the flames of the revolution.

In all the capitalist countries today, the main bourgeois and revisionist parties have their own trade-unions. These trade-unions, are now acting in unity and have established close collaboration in order to hold back the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and corrupt the working class politically and morally.

In France and Italy, for instance, the trade-unions of the revisionist parties are large and powerful unions. But what do they do? They try to keep the proletariat in bondage, to lull it to sleep and, when it grows angry and rebellious, to set it on the course of negotiations with the boss class and to shut the mouths of the workers with some very small crumbs from the capitalist su-

perprofits. And what they give them is then taken back by raising prices.

Therefore, to free itself from capitalism, it is essential for the proletariat of every country to shake off the yoke of the trade-unions dominated by the bourgeoisie and opportunists, as well as that of any kind of social-democratic and revisionist organization or party. All these organisms support the owning class in various ways and try to create the illusion that «they are a great force», that «they are a brake», that «they can impose themselves on the big capitalists» allegedly in favour of the proletariat. This is nothing but a big fraud. The proletariat has to smash these organisms. But how? It must destroy them by fighting the leadership of these trade-unions, by rising against their treacherous connections with the bourgeoisie, by breaking up the «calm», the «social peace» which they want to establish, a «peace» which is disguised with the alleged revolts against the owning class which the unions engage in from time to time.

It is possible to work to destroy these trade-unions by getting into them in order to fight and erode them from within and oppose their unjust decisions and actions. This activity must involve the biggest and most powerful groups possible of workers in the factories. In every case the aim must be to achieve a steel unity of the proletariat in the fight not only against the employers but

also against their agents, the trade-union bosses. The forceful exposure of all the traitor elements at the head of trade-unions, of the bourgeois degeneration of the trade-union leadership and the reformist trade-unions in general, frees the workers from many illusions they still have about this leadership and these trade-unions.

While infiltrating the existing trade-unions, the Marxist-Leninists never descend to the trade-unionist, reformist, anarcho-syndicalist, revisionist positions, which characterize the leadership of these trade-unions. They never become partners with the revisionists and the other bourgeois and opportunist parties in the leadership of trade-unions. Their aim is to expose the bourgeois character and reactionary role which the trade-unions, in general, have today in the capitalist and revisionist countries, to undermine these organizations in order to open the way to the setting up of genuine proletarian trade-unions.

The organization of the masses of the youth is of special importance to the Marxist-Leninist parties. The role of the youth in the revolutionary movements has always been great. From its very nature the youth is for the new and against the old, and shows itself ready to fight for the triumph of everything progressive, revolutionary. However, on its own, it is incapable of finding the right road. Only the party of the work-

ing class can show it this road. When the inexhaustible revolutionary energies of the youth are united with the energies of the working class and the other working masses to wipe out oppression and exploitation, for national and social liberation, there is no force which can stop the triumph of the revolution.

However, in the capitalist and revisionist countries today, the majority of the youth expend their energies in wrong directions. They are misled by the bourgeoisie and revisionism and often turn to adventurism and anarchism or fall into utopia and despair, because they have been disorientated and bemused and take a gloomy view of the future, the prospects for the fulfilment of their political, material and spiritual demands.

The Marxist-Leninists always pay very great attention to the youth, try to enlighten them and convince them that the aspirations and desires of the youth can be fulfilled only on the road Marxism-Leninism shows them, and under the leadership of the working class and its party. They are working to free the youth from the influence of the bourgeoisie and revisionists, from the «leftist», Trotskyite, or anarchist movements, and to mobilize them in revolutionary organizations, to draw them on to the road of the revolution.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist party and the revolutionary communists take part actively in the

workers' strikes and demonstrations and fight to turn them into political strikes and demonstrations, so as to make life impossible for capitalism, the employers, cartels, monopolies and the trade-union chiefs. In the course of this broad activity the proletariat will come to grips more often and more openly with the armed forces of the bourgeois order, but from these clashes it will learn to fight better. In the course of the struggle it also finds what forms of organization and revolutionary struggle are possible, correct, and appropriate. «You cannot learn to swim without getting into the water,» goes a popular saying. Without fighting by means of strikes, demonstrations, without active involvement in actions against capitalism in general, the struggle for the final victory cannot be organized and intensified, the bourgeois order cannot be overthrown.

The revolution is not prepared by merely talking, like the various revisionists, or by theorizing about the «three worlds», like the Chinese revisionists. It cannot triumph on the peaceful road. Lenin did speak of this possibility, in specific instances, but he always put the main stress on revolutionary violence, because the bourgeoisie never surrenders its power voluntarily. **The history of the international workers' and communist movement, of the development of revolutions and the victories of the working class in a number of former socialist countries, and in our socialist**

country, shows that up till now revolutions have triumphed only through armed insurrection.

Revolutionary armed insurrection has nothing in common with military putsches. The former has as its aim the radical political overthrow of the old regime, smashing it to its very foundations. The latter do not, and cannot, lead to the overthrow of the order of oppression and exploitation, or the liquidation of imperialist domination. The armed insurrection is based on the support of the broad masses of the people, whereas the putsch is an expression of mistrust of the masses, of isolation from the masses. Putschist tendencies in the policy and activity of a party which calls itself a party of the working class are a deviation from Marxism-Leninism.

In accord with the concrete conditions of a country and the situations in general, the armed uprising may be a sudden outburst or a more protracted revolutionary process, but not an endless one without perspective, as advocated by Mao Tsetung's «theory of protracted people's war». If you compare the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the revolutionary armed insurrection with Mao's theory on «people's war», the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist, anti-scientific character of this theory becomes clearly apparent. The Marxist-Leninist teachings on the armed insurrection are based on the close combi-

nation of the struggle in the city with that in the countryside under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary party.

Being opposed to the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, the Maoist theory considers the countryside as the only base of the armed insurrection and neglects the armed struggle of the working masses in the town. It preaches that the countryside must keep the city, which is considered as the stronghold of the counterrevolutionary bourgeoisie, besieged. This is an expression of distrust in the working class, the negation of its hegemonic role.

While adhering unwaveringly to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the violent revolution as a universal law, the revolutionary party of the working class is resolutely opposed to adventurism and never plays with armed insurrection. In all conditions and circumstances, it carries out an unceasing revolutionary struggle and activity in various forms, in order to prepare itself and the masses for the decisive battles in the revolution, for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie with revolutionary violence. But only when the revolutionary situation has fully matured does it put armed insurrection directly on the order of the day and take all the political, ideological, organizational and military measures to carry it through to victory.

Propaganda is a powerful means in the hands of a Marxist-Leninist party for the preparation of the masses for the revolution, but it must be fiery, clear and convincing. Revolutionary propaganda is worthless if it is only phrase-mongering. Only an incisive propaganda, closely linked with the problems of life, with the general problems and local questions, a propaganda which creates and encourages the spirit of initiative among the broad masses, can educate the proletariat and the other working masses politically and ideologically, can get them into action and prepare them for revolution.

Apart from the great means of force it has at its disposal, like the army, the police, etc., the capitalist bourgeoisie in all countries also has wide experience of the struggle against the proletariat and its activity. Likewise, it possesses an entire propaganda network, including the press, radio, television, films, theatres, music, etc. All this propaganda has such power to corrupt that it is capable of temporarily disorientating, perverting and weakening the efforts of the proletariat and its struggle for liberation.

In the states of so-called bourgeois democracy, where a measure of «democratic freedom» also exists, it is not enough to carry on only the normal journalistic propaganda against capitalism in general. The newspapers of various bourgeois and

revisionist parties are constantly raising a hue and cry, not against the bourgeois order, of course, but against individuals, those who try to grab more than their share of the cake at the big table where they all sit down together to gorge themselves at the expense of the people.

The propaganda, especially the press of the new Marxist-Leninist parties, is faced with a very great task: to expose the falsity of bourgeois «democracy», to tear the mask from all its manoeuvres, as well as from the demagogy of the revisionists and other lackeys of capital. The Marxist-Leninist propaganda and press tell the naked truth, show the road to social and national liberation through revolution, while the bourgeois and revisionist propaganda and press deceive people, lull them to sleep and disorientate them, in order to divert the masses from the revolution, to lead them up blind alleys, to keep them enslaved.

But in order to enlighten the masses, to convince them of the correctness of the political line of the party of the working class, to prepare them for the revolution, propaganda alone is not sufficient. Lenin says that to prepare the revolution,

> «...*the political experience of these masses themselves is necessary*»*.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 92 (Alb. ed.).

Propaganda becomes effective, hits the target, only when it is carried on together with revolutionary action. Without action thought withers away. This activity is not and must not be an adventure, but a stern struggle, a fierce clash with the class enemies, which passes from a simpler to a higher form, which overcomes numerous difficulties and accepts all the sacrifices the revolution demands.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties stand in the vanguard and not at the tail-end of revolutionary action. The temporarily limited possibilities of the struggle and efforts by means of which they must and do oppose the great force of capitalist reaction, do not discourage them. They teach their members to be courageous and to bear in mind that a correct, well-considered, mature, and determined action on their part has profound repercussions among the masses who see it and hear about it. When the communists act in this way, the masses realize that the aims of this or that revolutionary action are in the interest of the proletariat and the exploited. Courage and maturity in actions are of great importance, because in this way, little by little, ground is gained and progress made in building up the surge of the revolution. Revolutionary action links the parties of the working class with the masses, brings them to the head of the masses, and enables them to triumph over the reformist, revisionist parties.

«Every step taken by a genuine movement,» says Marx, *«is worth more than a dozen programs»**.

Apart from the revolutionary forces led by the Marxist-Leninist party, in the capitalist countries there are also other forces which fight and clash with the police, the gendarmerie, etc. Many of the actions and attacks by these forces have a terrorist, adventurist, and anarchist character. They are presented under all sorts of colours and labels and are guided by various ideologies. Such actions are often organized at the instigation and with the funds of the secret services of capitalist countries and, among other things, are aimed at discrediting the Marxist-Leninist parties by attributing such actions to these parties. The fascist elements or the secret agents of the bourgeoisie, who frequently organize and lead these actions, try to take advantage of the discontent, the anger and the courage of the proletariat, school pupils and students, the youth in general, in order to involve the various groups and movements emerging from these masses in actions which not only have nothing in common with the genuine revolutionary movements, but also seriously jeopardize them, create the impression

* K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. 2, p. 8, Tirana 1975 (Alb. ed.).

that the proletariat is degenerating and has become a lumpen proletariat.

Paying the proper attention to this question, the Marxist-Leninist parties, on the one hand, must convince the masses, from their own experience, that revolutionary actions have a completely different character from terrorist and anarchist actions, and on the other hand, must fight to win the revolutionary elements, who have been deceived, away from the ranks of terrorist and anarchist groups and the fascist elements and secret agents of the bourgeoisie operating in these groups.

The Marxist-Leninist parties are parties of revolution. Contrary to the theories and practices of the revisionist parties, which are totally immersed in bourgeois legality and «parliamentary cretinism», they do not reduce their struggle simply to legal work, nor do they see this as their main activity. In the context of efforts to master all forms of struggle, they attach special importance to the **combination of legal with illegal work, giving priority to the latter,** as decisive for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the real guarantee of victory. They educate and teach their cadres, their members and sympathizers to know how to act intelligently, skilfully, and courageously under both legal and illegal conditions. But even when operating in the conditions of profound clandestinity, while trying to avoid exposing their

forces to the enemy and to safeguard the revolutionary organization from the enemy's blows, the Marxist-Leninist parties do not shut themselves away, do not weaken, or break their links with the masses, never for a moment interrupt their live activity among the masses, and never fail to utilize all the legal possibilities, which the conditions and circumstances permit, to the advantage of the cause of the revolution.

While entertaining no illusions about the possibility of seizing power on the parliamentary road, the Marxist-Leninist party may also consider it in order, in particularly favourable instances, to take part in such legal activities as elections to municipal councils, parliament, etc., with the sole aim of propagating its line among the masses and exposing the bourgeois political order. However, the party does not transform this participation into a general line of its struggle, as the revisionists do, does not make these the main, or even worse, the only forms of its struggle.

While utilizing the legal possibilities, the party seeks, finds and applies forms and methods of a revolutionary character, from the simplest to the most complicated, regardless of the sacrifices, while trying to make these forms and methods as popular and as acceptable as possible to the masses.

In their activity, the Marxist-Leninists are not worried about breaking and violating the

bourgeois Constitution, laws, rules, norms, and order with their revolutionary actions. They are fighting to undermine this order, to prepare the revolution. Therefore, the Marxist-Leninist party prepares itself and the masses to cope with the counterblows the bourgeoisie may strike in response to the revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the popular masses.

In the present conditions of development of the revolutionary and liberation movement, as a complicated process with a broad social basis, in which numerous class and political forces take part, the revolutionary party of the proletariat not infrequently comes up against the problem of collaboration and common fronts with other parties and political organizations at this or that stage of the revolution, on these or those problems of common interest. A correct, principled and at the same time flexible stand, far from any opportunism and sectarianism, on this problem is of major importance for drawing in, preparing and mobilizing the masses for the revolution and the liberation struggle. The Marxist-Leninist party is not and in principle cannot be against collaboration or common fronts with other political parties and forces, when the interests of the cause of the revolution require this and the situation makes it necessary. However, the Marxist-Leninist party never sees this as a coalition of chieftains and as an aim in itself, but as a means to unite and

arouse the masses in struggle. The important thing is that in these common fronts the proletarian party must never for a moment lose sight of the class interests of the proletariat and the final aim of its struggle, must not merge itself in the front, but must preserve its ideological individuality and its political, organizational, and military independence there, must fight to secure the leading role in the front and to implement a revolutionary policy there.

For the Marxist-Leninist party to be able to work out and apply a revolutionary strategy and tactics, a correct political line, to know how to find its bearings in difficult situations, to be able to cope with the enemies and overcome the obstacles, **it is absolutely essential that it carry out great, wide-ranging work for the study and assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist theory.**

One of the reasons why the former communist parties in the capitalist countries turned into revisionist parties was precisely because they had utterly neglected the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine was used only as an adornment, was turned into empty words and slogans, had not been implanted deeply in the consciousness of the party members, had not become part of their flesh and blood, and had not become a weapon for action. That small amount of work which was done for the study of Marxism-Leninism was aimed only at acquaint-

ing the party member with some cut-and-dried formulas, just enough to enable him to call himself a communist, to love communism in a sentimental way, while about how and in what manner this would be achieved he knew nothing, because he was not taught this.

The leaders of those parties, who were not lacking in words but were short on deeds, lived in bourgeois environment and infected the proletariat of their countries with liberal and reformist ideas.

Thus, the turn of the revisionist parties towards the bourgeoisie is a social-democratic opportunist evolution which had long been prepared by their leaders who are in fact social-democrats, the worker aristocracy, which led these so-called communist parties.

The Marxist-Leninist parties cannot fail to remember this negative experience and draw from it the lesson that they must organize the study and assimilation of Marxism-Leninism on a sound basis, always linking this study with revolutionary action.

The unity and co-operation of the Marxist-Leninist parties of different countries on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism is of special importance for the preparation of the revolution.

This unity will be strengthened and this cooperation will be extended in struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, against the bourgeoisie and modern revisionism of every description, Khrushchevite, Titoite, «Eurocommunist», Chinese, etc.

The revisionists, as enemies of the revolution, fight proletarian internationalism with all their strength and means, in order to wrest this powerful weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism from the hands of the world proletariat and the proletariat of every country.

It is the duty of the Marxist-Leninist parties to expose the manoeuvres of the Titoite revisionists and the «Eurocommunists» who call proletarian internationalism obsolete and outdated today, as well as those of the Soviet revisionists and Chinese revisionists who have distorted proletarian internationalism and are trying to use it as a weapon to realize their hegemonic, social-imperialist aims.

The Communist Party of China, which does not follow the principles of proletarian internationalism and does not support the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, has set out on the road of rapprochement and friendship with the social-democratic and bourgeois parties, including the ultra-right and reactionary ones. At the same time, it is trying to create various groups

dependent on and directed by it. It needs such groupings precisely in order to sabotage the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and the progressive elements who have set to work to awaken the people, to rouse them to revolution against the ruling cliques which are linked with the superpowers.

The small groups, which call themselves parties and toe the Chinese line, as the opportunists they are, do nothing but defend and propagate the revisionist theories of the group of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping and its counterrevolutionary actions. These groups are devoid of any individuality of their own or any determination to fight according to the Marxist-Leninist theory.

The main slogan of these parties, which is also the basic slogan of the Chinese policy, is that, in the present situation, the sole and fundamental task of the proletariat is to defend national independence, which is allegedly threatened only by Soviet social-imperialism. They are repeating, almost word by word, the slogans of the chiefs of the Second International who abandoned the cause of the revolution and replaced it with the thesis of defence of the capitalist homeland. Lenin exposed this false and anti-Marxist slogan, which does not serve the defence of true independence but serves the instigation of inter-imperialist wars. He clearly defined what the stand of the true revolutionary should be towards the conflicts between imperialist groupings. He wrote:

«If the war is a reactionary imperialist war, that is, if it is being waged by two world coalitions of the imperialist, violent, predatory, reactionary bourgeoisie then every bourgeoisie (even of the smallest country) becomes a participant in the plunder, and my duty as a representative of the revolutionary proletariat is to prepare for the **world proletarian revolution** *as the* **only** *escape from the horrors of a world slaughter. . .*

That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, the revolutionary worker, the genuine socialist».*

The parties following the Chinese line have become apologists for the growth and strengthening of bourgeois armies, using the excuse that this is supposedly necessary for the defence of independence. They call on the working people to become obedient soldiers and to come out, together with the bourgeoisie, against all those who are fighting to weaken this main weapon of capitalist rule and exploitation. In a word, they want the proletariat and the working masses to serve as cannon fodder in the predatory wars which imperialism and social-imperialism prepare.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 28, pp. 324-325 (Alb. ed.).

At the same time these hangers-on of the Chinese have become ardent defenders of the bourgeois capitalist state institutions, especially of NATO, the European Common Market, etc., which they consider as the main factors for the «defence of independence». Like the Chinese leaders, they whitewash and prettify these pillars of capitalist domination and expansion. They are assisting precisely those organisms which, in reality, have seriously violated the independence and sovereignty of their countries.

For these pseudo-Marxists, alliance with the big bourgeoisie, defence of the bourgeois army, support for NATO, the European Common Market, etc., is a troublefree road because it not only does not lead them to clashes with the bourgeoisie but, on the contrary, ensures its favours.

These positions of these groupist elements without a future are leading them towards unification with the parties of «Eurocommunism» and the bourgeoisie, and this is bound to happen, because China itself is calling on the proletariat to unite with the bourgeoisie. Already, there is no difference whatsoever between these pseudo-Marxist-Leninists and Marchais.

The Marxist-Leninists must be very much on guard against the empty phrases which the modern revisionists, the social democrats and the pseudo-Marxist-Leninists use about proletarian internationalism, the unity of proletarians in the

defence of peace, etc. Proletarian internationalism is genuine when people work self-sacrificingly to assist and carry out revolutionary actions, to create a real situation of revolutionary struggle, in their own country in the first place. At the same time, as Lenin says, they must support, with propaganda, sympathy and material aid, this struggle and line in all countries without exception. Anything else, he teaches us, is a fraud and *Manilovism.*

Therefore, we must be very much on our guard against such pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-revolutionary, pseudo-internationalist elements, whether individuals or small groups, or parties which call themselves Marxist-Leninist, but which, in fact, are not so, but are social-chauvinist, centrist and petty-bourgeois. All these parties which are beating their breasts about their proletarian internationalism, about the defence of peace, about reforms, etc., serve capital.

The Chinese revisionists, also, talk about proletarian internationalism at times, but they stand on nationalist and chauvinist positions. The Chinese leaders are among those who beat their breasts and swear «to god» that they are for proletarian internationalism, for peace, for the struggles of the proletariat and its claims, but in practice they stand aside and do nothing but issue deceptive phrases to split the revolutionary forces.

The important task the Marxist-Leninist

parties are faced with is to strengthen proletarian internationalism, which must be developed amongst all parties, big or small, old or new. All of them must strengthen the unity between them and co-ordinate their political, ideological and fighting actions.

By stressing this important line, which is a primary task of the Marxist-Leninist parties in order to be able to launch a frontal attack on world capitalism, its enslaving policy, as well as on its intrigues, trickery and alliances with Soviet, Titoite, Chinese, Italian, French, Spanish and other modern revisionisms, these parties will create a powerful front which will become ever more unbreakable day by day. If they act in unity and all strike at the forces of reaction together, if they expose all the intrigues which capitalism and modern revisionism concoct in various ways in order to put down the revolution and quell the class struggle, their triumph is assured.

We Marxist-Leninists must fight and call on the workers, wherever they are, to rise up against their age-old enemies and break their chains, to carry out the revolution, and not submit to monopolies and capitalists, as the modern revisionists advocate. The task of the Marxist-Leninists, of the true revolutionaries is to call on the proletarians and the peoples to rise for the new world, for their world, for the socialist world.

PART TWO

I

THE THEORY OF «THREE WORLDS» — A COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY CHAUVINIST THEORY

Today the Chinese revisionists, also, have come out openly and are fighting on a broad front against the Leninist theory and strategy of the revolution and the liberation struggle of the peoples. They are trying to oppose this glorious scientific theory and strategy with their theory of «three worlds», which is a false, counterrevolutionary, and chauvinist theory.

The theory of «three worlds» is in opposition to the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, or more exactly, is a negation of it. It is of no consequence to know who first invented the term the «third world», who was the first to divide the world in three parts, but it is certain that Lenin

did not make such a division, while the Communist Party of China claims paternity to it, asserting that Mao Tsetung invented the theory of «three worlds». If he is the author who first formulated this so-called theory, this is further evidence that Mao Tsetung is not a Marxist. But even if he only adopted this theory from others, this, too, is proof enough that he is not a Marxist.

The Concept of the «Three Worlds» — a Negation of Marxism-Leninism

The notion of the existence of three worlds, or of the division of the world in three, is based on a racist and metaphysical world outlook, which is an offspring of world capitalism and reaction.

But the racist thesis which places the countries on three levels or in three «worlds», is not based simply on skin colour. It makes a classification based on the level of economic development of the countries and is intended to define the «great master race», on the one hand, and the «race of pariahs and plebs», on the other, to create an unalterable and metaphysical division in the interests of the capitalist bourgeoisie. It considers the various nations and peoples of the world as a flock of sheep, as an amorphous whole.

The Chinese revisionists accept and preach that the «master race» must be preserved and the «race of pariahs and plebs» must serve it meekly and devotedly.

Marxist-Leninist dialectics teaches us that there is no limit to development, that nothing stops changing. In this process of unceasing development towards the future, quantitative and qualitative changes occur. Our epoch, like any other, is characterized by profound contradictions which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin defined so clearly. It is the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, hence, of great quantitative and qualitative transformations which lead to revolution and the seizure of power by the working class in order to build the new socialist society.

The whole of Marx's theory is founded on the class struggle and dialectical and historical materialism. Marx proved that capitalist society is a society divided into exploiting and exploited classes, that classes will disappear only when the classless society, communism, has been achieved.

Today we are living in the stage of the collapse of imperialism and the triumph of proletarian revolutions. This means that in present-day capitalist society there are two main classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which are in irreconcilable, life-and-death struggle with each other. Which of them will triumph? Marx and Lenin, Marxist-Leninist science, the theory and

practice of the revolution, provide us with convincing proof that, in the final analysis, the proletariat will triumph by destroying, overthrowing the power of the bourgeoisie, imperialism and all exploiters, and will build a new society, socialist society. They teach us also that even in this new society, classes, that is, the working class and working peasantry, which are closely allied to each other, will exist for a very long time, but there will also be remnants of the overthrown and expropriated classes. During this entire period, these remnants, as well as elements which degenerate and oppose the construction of socialism, will try to regain their lost power. Hence, under socialism, too, stern class struggle will exist.

Marxist-Leninists always bear in mind that in all countries, with the exception of those where the revolution has triumphed and socialist order has been established, there are the poor classes with the proletariat at the head, and the wealthy classes with the bourgeoisie at the head.

In every capitalist state, wherever it may be, and however democratic or progressive, there are oppressed and oppressors, there are exploited and exploiters, there are antagonisms, there is merciless class struggle. The varying intensity of this struggle does not alter this reality. This struggle has its ups and downs, but it exists and cannot be quelled. It exists everywhere, it exists in the United States of America between the proletariat

and the imperialist bourgeoisie, it exists, likewise, in the Soviet Union, where Marxism-Leninism has been betrayed and a new bourgeois-capitalist class which oppresses the working people of that country, has been created. Classes and the class struggle exist also in the «second world», as in France, Britain, Italy, West Germany, Japan. They exist also in the «third world», in India, Zaire, Burundi, Pakistan, the Philippines, etc.

Only according to Mao Tsetung's theory of «three worlds», classes and the class struggle do not exist in any country. It does not see them, because it judges countries and peoples according to bourgeois geo-political concepts and the level of their economic development.

To see the world as divided in three, into the «first world», «second world» and the «third world», as the Chinese revisionists do and not from the class angle, means to deviate from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the class struggle, means to negate the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the transition from a backward society to a new society, socialist society, and later to classless society, communist society. To divide the world in three means failure to recognize the characteristics of the epoch, to impede the advance of the proletariat and the peoples towards the revolution and national liberation, to impede their struggle against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, capital and reac-

tion in every country and in every corner of the world. The theory of «three worlds» advocates social peace, class conciliation, and tries to create alliances between implacable enemies, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the oppressed and the oppressors, the peoples and imperialism. It is an attempt to prolong the life of the old world, the capitalist world, to keep it on its feet precisely by seeking to extinguish the class struggle.

But the class struggle, the struggle of the proletariat and its allies to take power and the struggle of the bourgeoisie to maintain its power can never be extinguished. This is an irrefutable truth and no amount of empty theorizing about the «worlds», whether the «first world», the «second world», the «third world», the «non-aligned world», or the «umpteenth world», can alter this fact. To accept such a division means to renounce and abandon the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on classes and the class struggle.

After the triumph of the October Revolution, Lenin and Stalin said that in our time there are two worlds: the socialist world and the capitalist world, although at that time socialism had triumphed in only one country. Lenin wrote in 1921:

> *«...there are now two worlds: the old world of capitalism, that is in a state of confusion but which will never surrender voluntarily, and the rising new world, which is still*

*very weak, but which will grow, for it is invincible»**.

This class criterion of the division of the world is still valid today, regardless of the fact that socialism has not triumphed in many countries and the new society has not supplanted the old bourgeois-capitalist society. Such a thing is certainly bound to happen tomorrow.

The fact that socialism has been betrayed in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries does not in any way alter the Leninist criterion of the division of the world. Now as before, there are only two worlds, and the struggle between these two worlds, between the two antagonistic classes, between socialism and capitalism, exists not only on a national scale but also on an international scale.

The Chinese revisionists, who do not admit the existence of the socialist world under the pretext that the socialist camp no longer exists as a result of the betrayal by the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, deliberately ignore one thing, namely, that the emergence of modern revisionism does not in the least alter the general trend of history towards the revolution, towards the collapse of imperialism, regardless of the fact that capitalism still exists. At the same time, they ignore the fact that the immortal ideas

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 33, pp. 153-154 (Alb. ed.).

of Marxism-Leninism exist, are developing and triumphing, that the Marxist-Leninist parties exist, socialist Albania exists, the peoples fighting for freedom, independence and national sovereignty exist, and that the world proletariat exists and is fighting.

The Paris Commune did not triumph, it was suppressed, but it gave the world proletariat a great example. Marx said that the experience of the Commune revealed the temporary weakness of the French proletariat, nevertheless it prepared the proletariat of all countries for the world revolution and provided a great lesson as to the conditions necessary to achieve victory. Marx raised this great experience of the communards who «stormed the heavens» to the level of theory and taught the proletariat that it must smash the apparatus of the bourgeois state and its dictatorship with revolutionary violence.

The modern revisionists are cowards. They think that the counterrevolutionary forces are very powerful today. But this is not at all true. They are weaker than the peoples. The peoples with the proletariat at the head, are stronger. They will crush the counterrevolutionary forces, the forces of reaction, imperialism and social-imperialism. This view is based on the class analysis of the world. Any other view is wrong, regardless of how revisionists may disguise their activity and fears with revolutionary phrases.

When we Marxist-Leninists say that there are two, and not three or five, worlds, we are on the right road and, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, we must build our struggle against the capitalist bourgeoisie, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, and against the other imperialisms. This struggle must lead to the destruction of the old bourgeois-capitalist world and the establishment of the new socialist order.

The proletariat is the motive social force of our epoch. Lenin emphasized that the motive force which drives history forward is represented by that class which stands

> *«...at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc.»**.

Contrary to this thesis of Lenin's, however, the Chinese revisionists are trying to present the «third world» as the «great motive force which is driving the wheel of history forward». To make such a declaration means to give a definition of the motive force which is wrong in theory and practice. How is it possible in the present epoch

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 21, p. 147 (Alb. ed.).

of social development, which has at its hub the most revolutionary class, the proletariat, to call a grouping of states, the overwhelming bulk of which are ruled by the bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, indeed, even open reactionaries and fascists, the motive force? This is a gross distortion of Marx's theory.

The Chinese leadership takes no account of the fact that in the «third world» there are oppressed and oppressors, the proletariat and the enslaved, poverty-stricken and destitute peasantry, on the one hand, and the capitalists and landowners, who exploit and fleece the people, on the other. To fail to point out this class situation in the so-called third world, to fail to point out the antagonisms which exist, means to revise Marxism-Leninism and defend capitalism. In the countries of the so-called third world, in general, the capitalist bourgeoisie is in power. This bourgeoisie exploits the country, exploits and oppresses the poor people in its own class interests, to make the largest possible profits for itself and to keep the people in perpetual slavery and misery.

In many countries of the «third world», the governments in power are bourgeois, capitalist governments, of course, with differing political nuances. They are governments of the class hostile to the proletariat, the oppressed and poor peasantry, hostile to the revolution and liberation wars.

The bourgeoisie, which has state power in these countries, is protecting precisely that capitalist society which the proletariat in alliance with the poor strata of town and countryside, seeks to overthrow. It constitutes that upper class which, proceeding from its own narrow interests, is ready, at any moment, at any turn of events, to sell the wealth of the land and the underground assets of the country, the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the homeland, to foreign capitalism. This class, wherever it is in power, is opposed to the struggle and aspirations of the proletariat and its allies, the oppressed classes and strata.

Many of the states which the Chinese leadership includes in the «third world» are not opposed to American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. To call such states «the main motive force of the revolution and the struggle against imperialism», as Mao Tsetung advocates, is a glaring mistake that stands out like the Himalayas. There are other pseudo-Marxists, too, but they at least know how to hide and disguise themselves behind their bourgeois theories.

The Chinese revisionists have the same anti-Marxist view not only of the «third world» but also of what they call the «second world», where the big capitalist bourgeoisie and the big imperialists of yesterday, who are still imperialists, are ruling. In the countries of the so-called second world, there is a large and powerful proletariat,

which is exploited to the bone, which is kept down by crushing laws, the army, the police, the trade-unions, by all these weapons of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Both in the countries of the «third world» and in those of the «second world», it is the bourgeois capitalist class, the same social forces, which are ruling the proletariat and the peoples and which must be smashed. Here, too, the main motive force is the proletariat.

Just as they do in the «third world» and the «second world», in the United States of America and the Soviet Union, too, the Chinese revisionists ignore the proletariat, which represents the great army of the revolution, negate precisely the main motive force of society, that force which has to attack the monopoly bourgeoisie, its class enemy and the enemy of the world revolution in general.

Mao Tsetung's theory of «three worlds» denies this great reality and discounts the proletariat of Europe and the other developed countries. It is true that some degeneration also exists in the ranks of the proletariat, whether of the so-called third, second, or first world, because the bourgeoisie is not sitting idle, but is fighting its enemy, not only with weapons and oppression, but also politically and ideologically, with the way of life it creates, etc. But the fact that some stratum of the proletariat, such as the labour aristocracy, degenerates, does not mean that Marxism-Leninism should be abandoned and the decisive

role of the working class in the world revolutionary process denied. Through correct Marxist-Leninist education, through their daily revolutionary activity, the genuine communists protect the proletariat of every country and every «world» from degeneration and mobilize it to struggle against its oppressors, be they British or French, Italian or German, Portuguese or Spanish, American or Japanese, etc.

In the United States of America, also, which is the head of world imperialism, there is a big proletariat. Being one of the most industrialized countries of the world, it is also the wealthiest, therefore the crumbs that capital gives away to deceive the proletariat are a little bigger than those in the other bourgeois countries. In the United States of America the way of life has a greater influence on the proletariat, but we cannot, in the least, negate the role and contribution of the American proletariat to the revolution in that country. In fact, in the United States of America also, there is a section of opinion opposed to imperialism, predatory wars, oppression by the capitalists, trusts, banks, etc. Even among the strata of the petty-bourgeoisie in that country there is a resistance to the oppression by big capital.

By negating the class struggle, the Chinese theory of «three worlds» also negates the struggle of the peoples to free themselves from foreign

domination, to win democratic rights and freedoms, negates their struggle for socialism. This counterrevolutionary and anti-scientific theory rules out the struggle of the peoples against their enemies — imperialism, social-imperialism and the entire international big bourgeoisie.

To put the peoples into «three compartments» and preach that only the «third world» aspires to liberation from imperialism, that it alone is supposedly the «main motive force against imperialism», is a deception and a flagrant deviation from Marxism-Leninism. If the imperialists and capitalists are to be included in the «first world» and in the «second world», then the question arises: where are the peoples of these «two worlds», who are also fighting for their liberation against those same oppressors who are oppressing the «third world», to be put? The inventors and supporters of the division of the world in three are quite unable to answer this question, because, according to their anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist concept, they merge the imperialists, the rulers and the peoples into one.

Marxist-Leninists cannot identify the Soviet peoples with the anti-Marxist, social-imperialist, double-dealers and the new capitalists who are ruling them. Likewise, they cannot mix up and confound the American people with US imperialism. If they were to act as the Chinese revisionists are doing, then the revolutionaries would be

making a gross theoretical mistake and setting themselves against the revolution; they would be supporting precisely imperialism and social-imperialism, the forces of capital against which the proletariat and the people within the lair of their enemies are also fighting.

What is the sense of the Chinese call that the «third world» should unite in alliance with the «second world» to fight half of the «first world», when such a division of the world confuses the individuality, aspirations and development of the peoples who are opposed to and in struggle against the oligarchy that oppresses them? The level of the peoples' resistance and revolutionary struggle is likewise different, but their ultimate aim, communism, is the same. In these conditions, we Marxist-Leninists must carry out propaganda work and mobilize ourselves so that, through continuous class struggles against imperialism, social-imperialism, capitalism and their fraudulent ideologies, we achieve the ultimate aim.

The Chinese revisionists not only merge and unite peoples into one with the rulers in the capitalist countries, but they also want to liquidate the identity of socialist countries, when they preach that these countries, too, can be included in the «third world».

How can a socialist country be identified with the «third world» in which antagonist classes, oppression and exploitation exist, and line up with

«kings and princes», as the Chinese leaders assert? The Chinese revisionists who call their country socialist, allege that they include themselves in the «third world» in order to assist the peoples of this «world». This is a fraud by means of which they want to conceal their expansionist aim. To assist and support the peoples' struggle, a true socialist country has no need to divide the world in three, or include itself in the «third world».

With our stands, guiding ourselves by class criteria, we Marxist-Leninists help the peoples, the proletariat, genuine democracy, sovereignty and freedom, and not the state where the kings, shahs and the reactionary cliques rule. We help those peoples and democratic states which want to liberate themselves from the yoke of superpowers, but we stress that this cannot be done properly, on the correct road and according to class criteria, unless they also fight the monarchs and the international monopolies that are connected with the superpowers. The Chinese leaders claim to have solved this complicated class problem by «merging» themselves in this imaginary «third world». But this is an anti-Marxist solution. Contrary to what the Chinese leaders claim, most of the states and governments of the «third world» are not for struggle against the «first world», or against US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, or the «second world».

The trend among the peoples of the world is

towards the struggle for liberation, for revolution, for socialism, but the governments of kings, emirs and reactionary cliques of the Mobutu and Pinochet type of the «third world» in which China has included itself, are not included in this trend.

In regard to the states of the so-called third world, the Chinese leadership does not make any class differentiation, according to the principles of proletarian internationalism and the interests of the world revolution. It takes no account of the fact that these national states, most of which are led by the upper strata of the bourgeoisie, are under the influence of, and closely linked by many threads with, US imperialism and also with Soviet social-imperialism.

In these states there are deep internal contradictions between the proletariat and the poor and oppressed peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie and all enslavers, on the other. The aid which a socialist country gives the peoples of these states should be a great stimulus to their progress towards the creation of a truly democratic state, without obscuring the perspective, without affecting the question of the triumph of the proletarian revolution and seizure of power by the proletariat. The revolution cannot be imported. It will be carried out by the proletariat and people of each country. Of course, the seizure of power will not be done overnight, but as Lenin teaches us, those conditions must be created so that, at each

turn of history, the proletariat will be found in the forefront of the struggle to overthrow the degenerate state power of dictators and the reactionary bourgeoisie and to establish the rule of the people.

The division we communists make of the world today, on the basis of the Leninist class criterion, does not hinder us from fighting the superpowers and supporting all the peoples and states that are seeking liberation and have contradictions with the superpowers. Socialist Albania has given wholehearted and powerful support to the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, because this struggle is in their own interests and is directed against imperialism and foreign colonial domination. But to conceal and distort the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the ideology and policy of the party of the proletariat, as the Chinese leaders do, this is anti-Marxist, a fraud and a deception. The Party of Labour of Albania has not done and will never do such a thing, because this would be an unpardonable crime against its own people, against other peoples, against the international proletariat and the world revolution.

In its division of the world into three, the Communist Party of China is advocating class conciliation.

The genuine Marxist-Leninists never forget the teachings of Lenin, who stresses that the opportunists and revisionists strive by hook or by crook to tone down the class struggle, to deceive the working class and the oppressed with «revolutionary» cliches, while divesting the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of its revolutionary content. This is what the Chinese revisionist leadership is doing when it preaches conciliation and peaceful coexistence between the working class and the bourgeoisie.

As Engels and Lenin teach us, the contradictions between classes or social forces with opposing fundamental interests cannot be reconciled, but on the contrary, become more and more severe and end up in socio-political conflicts. The very existence of the state proves that the antagonisms between classes are irreconcilable. Therefore, to try to mitigate these class antagonisms which can be seen in the various bourgeois and revisionist countries of the «third», «second», or the «first world», by preaching unprincipled unity, means to deny the objective character of the existence of contradictions and to treat this problem in an anti-Marxist way.

The Chinese «theoreticians» try to reconcile

classes that can never be reconciled, and this means that they are in revisionist, opportunist positions. The distortion of Marx's theory by the Chinese revisionists is quite obvious when they consider the countries which they include in the «third world» countries where class peace prevails, and the state in those countries an organism of class conciliation.

To accept the notion of the «third world», such as the Chinese leaders advertise, means to work to create an opinion which will serve to defend those state organisms which the bourgeoisie needs to oppress the working class and the masses of the people. The thesis of the toning down of the class struggle, as Lenin said when he was attacking the revisionists, justifies and endorses this oppression. To seek unity within the «third world», in fact, means to seek unity of the oppressed class with the oppressor class, that is, to try to tone down the antagonisms between the working masses and the bourgeoisie, between the people and the foreign oppressors. These sermons of the Chinese revisionists run counter to the interests of the national and social liberation of the peoples, to their aspirations for freedom, independence and social justice.

The majority of the states which allegedly make up the «third» or the «non-aligned world» are dependent on foreign finance capital which is so strong and so widespread that it has a decisive

weight in every aspect of life there. These states do not enjoy complete independence. On the contrary, they are dependent on this big finance capital, which develops that policy and spreads that ideology which justify the exploitation of peoples.

The bourgeoisie and imperialism take great pains to conceal this reality, and when exposed, they contrive various «theories» against the independence and sovereignty of states. In order to smother the aspirations of the peoples to freedom, independence and sovereignty, the bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians present these aspirations as «anachronistic», give them various metaphysical interpretations and counter them with the slogan of «world inter-dependence», which allegedly expresses the current trend of development of human society, or with the slogan of «limited sovereignty», which allegedly expresses the supreme interests of the so-called socialist community, etc.

The bourgeois-revisionist reality of the violation of the freedom, independence and sovereignty of nations and states in all forms and directions, shows the decay of the capitalist system. We are living in an epoch when the bourgeoisie is losing ground as a ruling class, while the world proletariat has become a colossal force and has entered into ceaseless, merciless struggle to get that class which exploits it off its back. Under the

blows of the peoples and the class struggle of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie was compelled to renounce colonialism *de jure*, and to formally recognize the freedom, independence and sovereignty of many countries, which it had been occupying and exploiting to the bone for a long time.

However, for many countries the freedom, independence and sovereignty, legally recognized by the capitalist states to their former colonies, have remained formal to this day, because the capitalists and imperialists are still ruling there in new forms. To prolong their domination over the former colonies, taking advantage of the economic, political and ideological backwardness of the peoples and the lack of organization of the revolutionary forces, these regressive forces of our time make extensive use of plots and intrigues to divide and rule, suitable terrain for which can still be found in these countries.

In dealing with this problem, it should not be thought that, since the former colonial countries have not yet won complete independence and sovereignty, their struggle has been useless. By no means. The struggle of the peoples for the emancipation of their small countries from the dictate and tutelage of the mighty — imperialism and social-imperialism — must not be underrated. On the contrary, the Party of Labour of Albania and the Albanian state have given and will continue to give unreserved support to this just

revolutionary and liberation struggle, which they have regarded as a victory of the peoples in strengthening their political independence and breaking free from colonial and neo-colonial domination. But we are against those revisionist theoreticians who preach that now the entire revolutionary struggle should be reduced to a struggle for national independence, to win and to defend this independence against the aggression of imperialist powers, while negating the struggle for social liberation. Only victory in this struggle guarantees genuine and complete national freedom, independence and sovereignty. These advocates of the exploiting order «forget» that the class struggle between the proletariat and its allies, on the one hand, and the local bourgeoisie and its external allies, on the other, is going on fiercely at all times, and some day it will lead to those moments, to those revolutionary situations, as Lenin calls them, when the revolution breaks out. The ever more favourable conditions that are being created in the world for anti-imperialist and democratic revolutions to develop on a large-scale and for their leadership by the proletariat must be utilized in order to go on from the struggle for national independence to another more advanced phase, to the struggle for socialism. Lenin teaches us that the revolution must be carried through to the end, by liquidating the bourgeoisie and its state power. Only on this basis can there

be talk of true freedom, independence and sovereignty.

According to our Marxist-Leninist concept, the people cannot have freedom and sovereignty in a society with antagonistic classes where the feudal or bourgeois class holds sway. Freedom, independence and sovereignty have a concrete socio-political content. Genuine and complete freedom and sovereignty are secured under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, while, where state power is in the hands of the exploiting class, the economic and political relations of inequality between the exploiters and the exploited and between countries lead to loss, or restriction of the freedom and sovereignty of the people. As a result, there can be no talk of real national freedom and sovereignty, and even less of people's sovereignty, in the countries which are included in the «non-aligned» or the «third world». Only from a scientific analysis based on the Marxist-Leninist theory is it possible to determine correctly which people is really free and which is enslaved, which state is independent and sovereign, and which is dependent and oppressed. The Marxist-Leninist theory clearly explains who are the oppressors and exploiters of the peoples, and which is the road for the peoples to become free, independent and sovereign. We Albanian communists understand the freedom, independence

and sovereignty of states and peoples only in this way, in the light of Marxism-Leninism.

The Attitude of the Chinese Revisionists to Contradictions is an Idealist, Revisionist and Capitulationist Attitude

The implementation of a correct revolutionary strategy based on the teachings of Marxism-Leninism demands not only an all-sided dialectical analysis and appreciation of the motive forces of the world revolutionary and liberation trend, the correct assessment of the enemy forces, with their strong and weak aspects, but also a correct and scientific understanding of the contradictions characteristic of our time.

If we interpret the contradictions in connection with the concrete facts and the real development of the situations, according to the teachings of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then we shall not make mistakes.

In connection with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders «theorize», «interpret», «philosophize», paraphrase and confuse many theses which the classics of Marxism-Leninism formulated so clearly. Interpreting contradictions differently from what they really are, they enter into agreements and compromises not in favour of the liberation struggle, the peoples, the revolution and the

construction of socialism, but in favour of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. These leaders, who pose as Marxist-Leninist philosophers, have two masks: one to present themselves as if they are in order with the Marxist-Leninist theory, and the other to distort it in practice.

Their stand in regard to the contradictions, alliances and compromises stems from a distorted and pragmatic analysis which they make of the international situation, the contradictions that exist in the world, the contradictions among the imperialist powers, among the various capitalist states, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, etc. This stand has its roots in their idealist and revisionist world outlook.

However, the Chinese leaders' laying of the problem of contradictions, alliances and compromises on the table for discussion is not fortuitous. The Chinese leadership has now thrown off its disguise and has come out openly against the revolution. It has become a standard-bearer of right opportunism, revisionism. Like all revisionists, the leaders of the Communist Party of China, also, are trying to «justify» their departure from the Marxist-Leninist theory, their revisionist orientation, by using quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Of course, they curtail, cut up and take these quotations out of their context, and thus mutilated, use them to peddle their reactionary stands and theses as Marxist-Leninist. But

the Chinese revisionists are neither the first nor the last to make these distortions, tendentious curtailments and interpretations of our correct theory. Long before them, the chiefs of social-democracy, the Titoites, the Soviet, Italian, French and other revisionists did the same thing and they are still at it.

In the first place, by juggling with the contradictions, the Chinese leaders are endeavouring to justify their stand towards US imperialism, to pave the way for their rapprochement and collaboration with it.

The Chinese revisionists claim that there is only one contradiction in the world of today, and that this puts the «third world», the «second world» and half of the «first world» in confrontation with the Soviet Union. Proceeding from this thesis which unites the peoples with a group of imperialists, they advocate that all class contradictions must be set aside and that the only fight must be against Soviet social-imperialism.

But let us analyse how things stand on the question of the contradictions between the peoples and the superpowers, and the contradictions between the superpowers themselves.

In the present conditions, in defining a consistent revolutionary strategy and tactics, the principled stand towards the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the

Soviet Union, which constitute the greatest force in defence of the capitalist system of oppression and exploitation, the main bastions of world reaction, assumes first-rate importance. They are sworn enemies, the most dangerous enemies of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world; they have taken upon themselves the odious role of the international gendarme against every revolutionary and liberation movement, and represent the most aggressive warmongering powers, which, with their actions are driving the world towards a devastating war.

No one, least of all the Party of Labour of Albania, can deny the existence of profound contradictions between the two greatest imperialist powers of our time — American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. We have continually stressed that the contradictions between the two superpowers not only exist, but are becoming deeper. Parallel with this, the superpowers, on their part, are making efforts to reach agreement over certain questions. Lenin explains this phenomenon with the two tendencies of capital. He said,

> «*...two tendencies exist — one which makes the alliance of all imperialists inevitable, and the other which pits some imperialists against others...*»*.

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 27, p. 418 (Alb. ed.).

But why are there irreconcilable contradictions and antagonisms between the two superpowers? Because, since they are big imperialist powers, each of them is fighting for world hegemony, to create new spheres of influence, for the enslavement and exploitation of peoples. The appetite and greed which each of them has, is the source of bickering and severe friction between them. This friction may lead to war between them, and even to a bloody world war.

We Marxist-Leninists must exploit the contradictions which exist between the superpowers in the interests of the revolution and the peoples' liberation struggles.

Exploiting the contradictions in the enemy camp is a component part of revolutionary strategy and tactics. Stalin described the exploitation of the contradictions and conflicts in the ranks of the enemies of the working class, within the country or among the imperialist states in the international arena, as an indirect reserve of the proletarian revolution. It is a well-known historical fact that the Soviet socialist state, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, took into account and exploited inter-imperialist contradictions in the period after the October Revolution, or during the years of the Second World War.

But in every instance, the assessment and exploitation of the contradictions amidst the enemies by the revolutionary forces, the socialist

countries, are the result of a concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis of these contradictions and their level of severity, of the ratio of forces at a given period or moment, in order to define in what way, in what form and by what means to exploit them. The principle is that these contradictions must always be exploited in favour of the revolution, the peoples and their freedom, in favour of the cause of socialism. The exploitation of contradictions amidst the enemies should lead to the growth and strengthening of the revolutionary and liberation movement, and not to making it weaken and fade, should lead to an ever more active mobilization of the revolutionary forces in the struggle against the enemies, especially the main ones, without allowing any illusions about them to be created among the peoples.

The two superpowers, the United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union, have the suppression of the revolution and socialism as the first point in their program. Not only do the Chinese leaders not stress this fact, which is an expression of the irreconcilable contradiction between socialism and capitalism, but they even deny it in practice. Of course, it is impermissible for Marxist-Leninists to forget that the superpowers, despite the struggle between them for hegemony, despite the contradictions they have, never lose sight of their common objective of suppressing the peoples who demand freedom, and

of sabotaging the revolution, and this, too, leads to general or local wars. On this question, the Chinese revisionists continue to hold their known standpoint of the fight only against Soviet social-imperialism, which, according to them, is the more dangerous, more aggressive and more bellicose. They relegate US imperialism to second place and stress that the United States of America «wants the status quo, that it is in decline». From this the Chinese revisionists arrive at the conclusion that an alliance with American imperialism against Soviet social-imperialism can and should be reached.

US imperialism is not at all weakened or tamed, as the Chinese leaders claim. On the contrary, it is aggresive, savage and powerful, like Soviet social-imperialism. The fact that US imperialism no longer has that dominant position it held in the past, does not alter anything. This is the dialectics of the development of capitalism and it corroborates Lenin's theses that imperialism is capitalism in decline, decadence. But, proceeding from this, to go so far as to underestimate the actual aggressive economic and military strength of one or the other superpower, is impermissible. It is likewise impermissible, proceeding from a real weakening and decline of the imperialists' power, to say that one imperialism has become less dangerous and that the other is more dangerous. Both imperialist superpowers

are dangerous, because neither of them ever forgets the fight against those who want to dig the grave for them, and those who want to dig the grave for the superpowers are the peoples.

To advocate the struggle against Soviet social-imperialism only, and to cease the fight against US imperialism in fact, as the Chinese leaders are doing, means to fail to uphold the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism. There is no doubt about the fact that Soviet social-imperialism must be fought to the finish. But to fail to fight just as hard against US imperialism, too, this is unacceptable, this is betrayal of the revolution. If the Chinese course is followed, then it will not be clear what US imperialism is and what Soviet social-imperialism is, why these two superpowers have contradictions and what is the essence of these contradictions, what is the basis of the struggle between them, which we must deepen, and what we must do to prevent these two imperialist states from unleashing a world war, etc.

If we understand these questions properly in theory, and if we act correctly on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory, then the absolute need for us to assist and support the peoples fighting against the two superpowers and the bourgeois capitalist cliques ruling them will become quite clear. The capitalist world today is going through a grave crisis. But this crisis must be assessed in all its magnitude, and likewise, the

contradictions which exist in the capitalist world must also be assessed in all their gravity.

Their pragmatic and anti-Marxist logic leads the Chinese revisionists to present the Soviet Union as a country developing without contradictions, as an imperialism which is ruling the other revisionist countries, like Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria, without problems. They present the Soviet bloc as a bloc in ascendency, and the Soviet Union as the only imperialism left in the world, bent on establishing its hegemony everywhere.

If we speak of the hegemony of the Soviet Union over the revisionist countries of Eastern Europe, this is expressed, in the first place, in the military occupation of these countries by the Soviet armed forces, in the ruthless and unscrupulous plunder of their assets by Soviet social-imperialism, which is trying to integrate them completely into the system of Soviet republics. Naturally, the revisionist Soviet Union is encountering opposition in these efforts. The time will come when this opposition and these contradictions, which exist in latent form within the revisionist pack, will become more acute and will burst out.

We have described Soviet social-imperialism as aggressive because it attacked and occupied Czechoslovakia, because it has intervened in Africa and elsewhere, and has plans and is preparing for other acts of aggression. But can it be

said that US imperialism has committed fewer acts of aggression, or is less aggressive than Soviet social-imperialism?

The Chinese leadership has forgotten the aggression of the United States of America against Korea, it has forgotten the prolonged and barbarous war against Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, it has forgotten its war in the Middle East, its intervention in the republics of Central America, etc. It has erased all these things from the ledger and now comes out with the conclusion that US imperialism has allegedly been tamed! It forgets that US imperialism has extended its tentacles all over the world, has set up its military bases everywhere, and is developing and strengthening them. Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai forgot this, the Chinese revisionist leadership forget this when they tell us that US imperialism has allegedly been weakened and tamed and, hence, an alliance can be concluded with it! To act in this way means to seek to extinguish the struggle against imperialism in general and against US imperialism in particular, and indeed even against Soviet social-imperialism, which China claims to be fighting so hard.

It is true that Soviet social-imperialism has a great hunger for expansion. Its intervention in Angola and Ethiopia, its attempts to establish bases in the Mediterranean and several Arab

countries, to seize the Red Sea narrows or to establish military bases in the Indian Ocean, all these are blatant imperialist actions. But these positions of Soviet social-imperialism are not consolidated to the same extent that US imperialism has consolidated its neo-colonialist economic, strategic and military positions in other countries. It is precisely this situation that the Chinese leadership appears to underestimate, but in reality it recognizes and supports it.

At the same time, the Chinese revisionists cannot fail to see that, despite the contradictions existing between the capitalist states of Western Europe and US imperialism, they are closely linked with one another, linked through political, military and economic alliances, such as NATO, the European Common Market, etc. It is impossible for the Chinese leadership not to know that US capital has penetrated deeply into the economies of the countries of Western Europe, and not only there, but also into Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The Chinese leadership knows full well that the United States of America has invested and continues to invest scores of billions of dollars in various countries of the world. Then what is it hoping for? Is it hoping that the western capitalist countries, with all their contradictions with the United States of America, will break away from it in order to weaken their own camp, to renounce that armed might, those

economic, social and cultural ties they have with it, and leave themselves naked before Soviet social-imperialism for the sake of China's interests? This is an absurdity of the Chinese foreign policy.

As we have already stressed, there is no doubt that the contradictions existing between the two superpowers and the other imperialist and capitalist-revisionist countries should be exploited by the revolutionary and liberation forces. But it is important that this should be understood correctly, should always be seen from the angle of the interests of the revolution and subordinated to them. The exploitation of contradictions among the imperialist powers and groups, the capitalist-revisionist states, etc., can never be an aim in itself for the working class and the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries.

To exploit the contradictions between the imperialist countries and the two superpowers means to deepen the rifts between them, to encourage the revolutionary and patriotic forces of these countries to oppose US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, which want to subjugate them economically, politically and militarily, to exploit them and deny them their national identity, etc.

But what is China doing?

The Chinese policy advocates the «holy alliance» of the western capitalist countries with the United States of America. Indeed it goes even further. It advocates the alliance of the proletariat of the countries of Western Europe with the reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries. Where is the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line here? Where is the line of exploiting contradictions? Do the Chinese leaders think that they will be able to strengthen this bloc against the Soviets, according to their own desires, with such a policy? This is the utopia they are dreaming of, but it is a metaphysical view on their part.

The United States of America, the western capitalist countries, and along with them, Japan and Canada, too, are not so crazy as the Chinese leaders think, their policy is not so naive as the Chinese policy. For their part, they know very well how to exploit the contradictions existing between China and the Soviet Union. They know how to go about it and act in order to weaken the big aggressive power, the Soviet Union. They have long been fighting in this direction, and one cannot say that they have achieved no results. The United States of America and all the other capitalist states are inciting the contradictions between the revisionist countries of the East and the Kremlin.

Now China, too, has begun to practise this old American policy. Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Rumania and Yugoslavia was according to this course. But China's opening up to Europe, its fanning up of contradictions and, especially, its attempts to create a favourable field of action for itself in the Balkans, all these things are not done in the interests of the peoples and the revolution. They are part of the Chinese policy of incitement to war, the aim of which is that the peoples of Europe should kill one another and become cannon fodder in an imperialist war.

«Pravda» has long been engaged in polemics with the United States of America, of course without effect, accusing it of a rapid build up of armaments. Its concern is not to criticize this action of the United States of America, since the Soviet social-imperialists themselves are doing the same thing. The problem is that the increase of US military potential relatively weakens Soviet fighting strength and forces the Soviet Union to follow the United States of America step by step, in order to balance its military potential and aggressive power. However, keeping up with US imperialism in the armaments race weakens the economy of the Soviet Union, because it means that large material, monetary and human funds are transferred from the economy to the army. This is what is worrying Brezhnev and company.

But the astonishing thing is that, through

their newspaper «Renmin Ribao», the Chinese revisionists, unreservedly take the side of the Americans, publishing article after article urging the United States of America not to lose the lead in the armaments race, but to ceaselessly increase its military potential. Thus it turns out, according to «Renmin Ribao», that it is not the United States of America which is arming, but only the Soviet Union. Such an advocate of the Americans as the Chinese revisionist leadership is becoming is not to be found in any other country. The bourgeoisie tries at least to preserve a sense of proportion in its criticisms and interpretations of realities, to weigh up the situations which are developing, tendentiously, of course. But to act in the way the Chinese leaders are doing, is something quite unprecedented.

At his meeting with Ten Hsiao-ping, the Secretary of the American Department of State, Vance, explained to him that the «United States of America has military superiority over the Soviet Union». But Teng Hsiao-ping told a large group of American journalists who were visiting China at that time, that «Peking does not believe» Vance's statement, and that the «Soviet Union is much superior to the United States of America». «None so deaf as he who does not want to hear», as the saying goes.

The Chinese thesis, presented as an alleged Marxist thesis, which casts doubt on the fact that

it is not just the one but both the imperialist superpowers which are seeking the redivision of the world, to create new colonies, to oppress the peoples and extend their markets, cannot be accepted.

The very posing of the question that one imperialism is stronger and the other weaker, one is aggresive and the other tamed, is not Marxist-Leninist. The presentation of the question in this manner is a reflection of a reactionary view which leads the Chinese revisionists into alliance with the United States of America, NATO and the European Common Market, with the King of Spain, the Shah of Iran, Pinochet of Chile and all the fascist dictators. The Chinese policy, which is harmless to US imperialism, which is harmless to the power of the banks and the biggest capital of our time, is an out-and-out bourgeois reformist, pacifist policy, and very stupid.

The Chinese leaders cannot fail to see that American finance capital, the trusts and monopolies are by no means reducing their investments abroad, that they are not giving up their ambitions to exploit and enslave, but, on the contrary, are becoming stronger and trying to alter the ratio of forces in the world in their own favour.

The Soviet social-imperialists are doing the same thing. The aim of their economic policy, of the big trusts which exist in the Soviet Union, is to suck the blood of satellites and other coun-

tries by all manner of means. They have dressed themselves up in a new cloak and present themselves under another name, while they, too, strive to alter the ratio of forces to their own advantage, at first allegedly through agreements and negotiations, but, when the time comes, also by force, i.e., war.

With their reasoning that the United States of America «wants the status quo», that «it is on the decline», and that Soviet social-imperialism is the «more dangerous, more aggressive, more bellicose», etc., the Chinese revisionists want to prove that the United States of America can and should become the ally of China against the Soviet Union. The various kinds of relations, which they are extending, the open support they give the increase in the war budget and the further arming of the United States of America confirm this.

The Chinese revisionists preach that the situation today is such that the Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries and the peoples can make a compromise with and rely on US imperialism. Our Party is against any compromise with ferocious US imperialism, because such a thing is not in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. We have been, are, and will be in struggle with US imperialism until its complete destruction. Likewise, we are and will be in struggle to the end with Soviet social-imperialism.

The support which China is giving US impe-

rialism is not in the least in favour of the revolution and the peoples, but in favour of the counter-revolution. With its reactionary political and ideological line, the Chinese leadership leaves the peoples of the world in the clutches of US imperialism. It wants them to remain docile, not to revolt, and even to unite with US imperialism against the other superpower, which wants to grab from the United States of America the assets it has built up from the toil and sweat of the peoples. China's leadership recommends to the capitalist countries of Europe, gathered in the European Common Market, that they should unite. It also lines up the peoples in the capitalist union of Europe. This stand means: keep quiet, no more talk about the revolution, no more talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat, but put yourselves in the service of the trusts, the capitalists and, along with them, create an even greater economic and military force to cope with Soviet social-imperialism.

The European Common Market, which China supports and is strengthening economically, is nothing but a means to preserve the maximum profits of the monopoly trusts of Western Europe and to group together the developed industrial states, in which the wealthy classes, as Lenin says, exact a colossal tribute from Africa, Asia, etc. By supporting these capitalist states, the Chinese leaders, in fact, are supporting the parasitism of a

handful of capitalists at the expense of the peoples of these countries, as well as of the peoples who have fallen into their clutches.

The theory of the «three worlds» of the Chinese revisionists, by means of which they try to justify their counterrevolutionary stands, is nothing but a variant of opportunism in the ranks of the workers' movement, which helps imperialism to create markets and exact profits at the expense of other peoples, so that the opportunists too, will receive some of the crumbs from the capitalists' table.

It is an undeniable fact that the Chinese leadership is defending the capitalist forces and states of Europe, and not supporting the revolutionary forces and proletariat, so that they rise and destroy the plans of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, «United Europe», the European Common Market and Comecon, in a word, all the pillars of the imperialist system, which, like a great monster, sucks the blood of the peoples.

Although it includes the developed capitalist states such as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy, etc., in the «second world», and irrespective of all its talk on the theoretical plane about their «double» character, the Chinese revisionist leadership does not consider these states enemies of the revolution. On the contrary, the Chinese have found it convenient to shut their eyes to this and reach open compromises with them, allegedly

in order to use them against Soviet social-imperialism.

The Chinese leadership, whose eyes have been blinded as a result of its pragmatic and anti-Marxist policy, «forgets» that such states as West Germany, Britain, Japan, France, Italy and others like these have been and are imperialist states, that the enslaving and colonialist tendencies, which have been characteristic of them traditionally, have not been and, as such, cannot be eliminated. It is true that after the Second World War these imperialist powers have been weakened, even greatly weakened, and that their former positions have changed to the advantage of American imperialism. Nevertheless, neither France, nor Britain, nor any other of them has given up the struggle to protect its markets or gain other markets in Africa, Asia and the countries of Latin America.

Among all these capitalist and imperialist states which are not so powerful as American imperialism, there are contradictions, but, at the same time, there is also the tendency to come to terms with one another.

After the Second World War, American imperialism helped its old, former allies in Europe to recover and the American monopolies linked themselves with the monopolies of these former allies in a tangle of common interests. But contradictions have always existed among them, as each of them tries to have a free hand in monop-

olizing markets, importing raw materials and exporting its industrial goods. In this instance, too, the international reality confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis on the two objective tendencies of capital.

It is likewise true that these capitalist states have contradictions not only with American imperialism but also with Soviet social-imperialism. The question arises: how should these contradictions be exploited? The inter-imperialist contradictions can by no means be exploited in the way the Chinese revisionists advocate. We Marxist-Leninists cannot defend the various reactionaries, the clique around Strauss or Schmidt in Germany, the British Conservative or Labourite leaders, simply because they have contradictions with Soviet social-imperialism. Were we to do so and support the preachings of the Chinese to the effect that «the capitalist states of Europe should unite in the Common Market», that «United Europe» should be strengthened so as be able to face Soviet social-imperialism, that would mean our agreeing to sacrifice the struggle and efforts of the proletariat of these countries to break the chains of enslavement, to sabotage the future of the revolution in those countries.

By making unprincipled compromises with American imperialism, the Chinese revisionists have betrayed Marxism-Leninism and the revolu-

tion. **Marxist-Leninists interpret the thesis of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on contradictions and compromises in its true spirit. The Chinese interpret this thesis in a way diametrically opposite to the truth.**

Following the Leninist course, our Party is not against every kind of compromise, but is against treacherous compromises. A compromise can be made when it is necessary and serves the interests of the class and the revolution, but always bearing in mind that it must not be at the expense of the strategy and loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, must not damage the interests of the class and the revolution.

In regard to the stand towards compromises, among other things, Lenin says:

> *«Is it permissible for the partisan of the proletarian revolution to conclude compromises with the capitalists or the capitalist class?... to reply to this general question in a negative way would obviously be absurd. Of course, the partisan of the proletarian revolution can conclude compromises or agreements with the capitalists. Everything depends on* **what sort** *of agreement and* **in what circumstances** *it is concluded. It is here and here alone that the difference can and must be sought between that agreement which is legitimate from the viewpoint*

of the proletarian revolution, and that agreement which is treacherous, perfidious (from the same viewpoint)».*

And Lenin goes on:

«The conclusion is clear: to completely rule out any agreement or compromise with the robbers is just as absurd as to justify participation in the robbery with the abstract thesis that, speaking in general, sometimes agreements with thieves are permissible and necessary».**

Lenin also said:

«The task of a truly revolutionary party is not to proclaim that it is impossible to abjure every sort of compromise, but to know how to maintain, **regardless of these compromises,** *since they are unavoidable, its loyalty to its own principles, to its own class, to its own revolutionary task, towards the work of preparing the revolution and the education of the masses of the people to achieve victory in the revolution»*.***

Only proceeding from these teachings of Lenin's can compromises be permissible. But how

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 30, pp. 562-563 (Alb. ed.).
** Ibid., p. 565.
*** V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 25, pp. 359-360 (Alb. ed.).

can a compromise with American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism be in the interest of socialism and the world revolution, when it is known that these two superpowers are the most ferocious enemies of the peoples and the revolution? Not only is this compromise not necessary, but, on the contrary, it endangers the interests of the revolution. To compromise, or to violate principles on problems of such importance, means to betray Marxism-Leninism.

If Mao Tsetung and the other Chinese leaders have had and still have a good deal to say about contradictions «in theory», then they ought to speak not only of exploiting inter-imperialist contradictions and of compromises with the imperialists, but, in the first place, they ought to speak of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and countries, on the one hand, and the two superpowers and the whole of world imperialism, on the other, the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. But the Chinese leaders are silent about these contradictions which exist objectively and cannot be wiped off. They speak of only one contradiction, which, according to them, is that between the entire world and Soviet social-imperialism, in this way, trying to justify their unprincipled compromises with American imperialism and all world capitalism.

Marxist-Leninist class analysis and the facts show that the existence of contradictions and rifts among the imperialist powers and groupings in no way overrides or displaces to a position of secondary importance the contradictions between labour and capital in the capitalist and imperialist countries, or the contradictions between the oppressed peoples and their imperialist oppressors. Precisely these, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the oppressed peoples and imperialism, between socialism and capitalism are the most profound, they are permanent, irreconcilable contradictions. Consequently, the utilization of inter-imperialist contradictions, or contradictions between the capitalist and revisionist states is meaningful only if it serves to create the most favourable conditions for the powerful development of the revolutionary and liberation movement against the bourgeoisie, imperialism and reaction. Therefore, these contradictions must be utilized without creating illusions among the proletariat and the peoples about imperialism and the bourgeoisie. It is essential to make the teachings of Lenin clear to the workers and peoples, to make them conscious that only an irreconcilable stand towards the oppressors and exploiters, only their resolute struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie, only the revolution, will ensure them genuine social and national freedom.

The utilization of contradictions among enemies cannot comprise the fundamental task of the revolution and be counterposed to the struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the reactionary and fascist dictatorship, the imperialist oppressors.

The stand of Marxist-Leninists on this question is clear. They address themselves to the peoples, the proletariat, call on the masses to rise to their feet to smash the hegemonic, oppressive, aggressive and warmongering plans of the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists, to overthrow the reactionary bourgeoisie and its dictatorship, both in the West and in the East.

As far as our socialist state is concerned, it has always exploited the contradictions in the enemy camp. In exploiting them, our Party proceeds from a correct assessment of the character of the contradictions existing between a socialist country and the imperialist and bourgeois-revisionist countries, and a correct assessment of inter-imperialist contradictions.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that the contradictions between a socialist country and capitalist and revisionist countries, which reflect contradictions between two classes with diametrically opposed interests, the working class and the bourgeoisie, are permanent, fundamental, irreconcilable. They run like a red thread through the entire historical epoch of the transition from cap-

italism to socialism on a world scale. On the other hand, the contradictions between the imperialist powers are expressions of contradictions amongst exploiters, amongst classes with common fundamental interests. Therefore, however severe the contradictions and conflicts between the imperialist powers may be, the danger of aggressive actions by world imperialism or various sections of it against the socialist country, remains a permanent real danger at any moment. Rifts between imperialists, inter-imperialist quarrels and conflicts may, at the most, weaken or temporarily postpone the danger of the actions of imperialism against the socialist country, therefore while it is in the interests of this country to utilize these contradictions in the enemy ranks, they cannot eliminate this danger. This has been forcefully stressed by Lenin who said:

> *«... the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable»**.

These teachings of Lenin's retain their full

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 29, p. 160 (Alb. ed.).

validity today. They have been thoroughly vindicated by a sequence of historical events, such as the fascist aggression against the Soviet Union in the years of the Second World War, the aggression of American imperialism in Korea and later in Vietnam, the imperialist and social-imperialist hostile activity and the various plots against Albania, etc. Therefore, our Party has stressed and stresses that any underestimation of the contradictions of a socialist state with the imperialist powers and the capitalist-revisionist countries, any underestimation of the danger of aggressive actions by the latter against socialist Albania, any relaxation of vigilance resulting from the idea that the contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves are very abrasive, and because of this they cannot undertake such actions against our Homeland, would be fraught with very dangerous consequences.

The Party of Labour of Albania also proceeds from the fact that only the revolutionary, liberation, freedom-loving and progressive forces can be true and reliable allies of our country, as the socialist country it is. Our country maintains state relations with different countries of the bourgeois-revisionist world, it utilizes the contradictions between the imperialist, capitalist and revisionist states and, at the same time, firmly supports the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the working class, the working masses and the peoples of

every country where such a struggle is going on, regarding this support as its lofty internationalist duty. The Party of Labour of Albania has always consistently upheld this viewpoint; at its 7th Congress it stressed once again that it will support the proletariat and the peoples, the Marxist-Leninist parties, the revolutionaries and progressives who fight against the superpowers, the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie and world reaction, for social and national liberation.

In the past, the Communist Party of China has also quoted well-known Marxist-Leninist principles and theses in regard to the contradictions. For example, in the known document entitled, «A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement», published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in 1963, the Chinese wrote: «These or those necessary compromises between socialist and imperialist countries do not require that the oppressed peoples and nations also make compromises with imperialism and its stooges». And they added: «Never should anybody, under the pretext of peaceful coexistence, demand that the oppressed peoples and nations renounce the revolutionary struggle». The Chinese leadership was talking in this way then, because at that time it was the Khrushchevite leadership who wanted the peoples and the communist parties to agree that American imperialism and its chiefs had be-

come peaceful and to submit to the Soviet policy of rapprochement with American imperialism. Now it is the leadership of the Communist Party of China which is preaching to the peoples, the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninist parties and the proletariat of the whole world, that they must enter into alliance with the imperialist or capitalist countries, and unite with the bourgeoisie and all reactionaries against Soviet social-imperialism. And the Chinese do not express these ideas in disguised phrases, but openly. Such vacillations and 180 degree turns have nothing to do with the principled Marxist-Leninist policy. They are characteristic of the pragmatic policy followed by all revisionists, who subordinate principles to their bourgeois and imperialist interests.

In order to justify their unprincipled compromises with American imperialism and the international bourgeoisie, the Chinese leaders and all the advocates of the theory of «three worlds» deliberately misrepresent the historical truth about the Soviet-German non-aggression pact of 1939 and the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance in the Second World War.

The Soviet-German non-aggression pact was a skilful utilization by Stalin of inter-imperialist contradictions. At that time the Hitlerite aggression against the Soviet Union was imminent. It was the period when nazi Germany had invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia, and fascist Italy had

invaded Albania, when the Munich agreement had been concluded and the German juggernaut of war was racing towards the East. The Soviet Union did not conclude an alliance, but a non-aggression pact with Germany, after the Western powers had refused to respond to Stalin's call for joint actions with the Soviet state to contain the nazi-fascist aggressors, and when it had become clear that these powers were urging Hitler to attack the land of the Soviets. The Soviet-German pact foiled their plans and gave the Soviet Union time to prepare to face the nazi aggression.

In regard to the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, it is known that it was concluded when Hitlerite Germany, after having occupied France and being at war with Britain, launched its savage aggression against the Soviet Union, when the war against the Axis powers had assumed a clear and pronounced anti-fascist and liberation character. It must be pointed out that at no time and in no instance did Stalin and the Soviet Union at that time advocate or call on the proletariat and the communist parties to renounce the revolution and unite with the reactionary bourgeoisie. Indeed, when Browder renounced the class struggle and advocated class conciliation, because the interests of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance allegedly required this, he was stigmatized by Stalin and the communist movement as a revisionist and renegade from the revolution.

As can be seen, nothing justifies the unprincipled compromises and alliances of the Chinese with American imperialism and the various reactionary forces. The historical analogy the Chinese revisionists are trying to make does not hold water.

In their propaganda, the Chinese leaders try to give the impression that we Albanians are allegedly against any compromise and do not strive to utilize the contradictions as we should. Naturally, they know that on these questions we take the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, but they continue to propagate this crooked line in order to conceal their departure from the scientific Marxist-Leninist theory and the road of revolution. They act in this way in order to denigrate the correct policy and stands of the proletarian party and state. Their accusations are groundless. Let us refer to the facts.

Our Party has always energetically supported the just cause of the Arab peoples, without exception, and will continue to do so to the end. We support the struggle of the Palestinian people against Israel, which long ago became a blind tool, a gendarme of US imperialism in the Middle East. It has been charged with the task of defending the rich Arab oil fields for the big monopoly companies of the United States of America and maintaining the status quo, as the Chinese revisionists call it.

Despite the fact that President Sadat and his government were formerly in alliance with the Soviet Union, we supported the struggle of the people of Egypt to regain the territories occupied by Israel. However, we exposed the aims of the Soviet Union against Egypt, and its game in the Middle East in general. Not for one moment have we remained silent about the colonialist aims of the Soviet Union towards Egypt. We have done the same thing in supporting the Egyptian people just as consistently in their fight against US imperialism and Israel.

While defending the interests of the Egyptian people and the other Arab peoples, our Party and people also expose the manoeuvres which US imperialism together with Israel is engaged in at present. We cannot approve of any course, any line of compromise with aggressor Israel, under the pretext that this is allegedly in favour of the Egyptian people.

The Chinese leadership, however, does not expose American imperialism. It applauds the Israeli-Egyptian agreements and urges the Arab peoples to come to terms, to make a compromise with American imperialism and Israel, which are their main enemies. Such a stand is not Marxist-Leninist. Such a compromise à la the Chinese is not in the interest of the peoples. The Chinese absurdity that breaking with one imperialism to throw yourself into the arms of anoth-

er imperialism «is acting in the interests of the freedom of the peoples», is totally inadmissable. These typically bourgeois manoeuvres and intrigues cannot be called Marxist-Leninist actions which help to deepen the contradictions between the two imperialist superpowers.

The Albanian Party and people are against predatory imperialist wars and resolutely support just national liberation wars which are, and must always be, to the advantage of the peoples, in favour of the revolution. They are not against supporting even a bourgeois state, when they see that those who rule this state are progressive persons and fight in the interests of the liberation of their people from imperialist hegemony. But our country cannot make common cause, or a compromise, as the Chinese revisionists call it, with a state ruled by a reactionary clique, which, in the interests of its own class and to the detriment of the interests of the people, enters into an alliance with one or the other superpower.

Likewise, socialist Albania is not against maintaining normal diplomatic relations with the states of the «third world», or the «second world». It is against such relations only with the two superpowers and the fascist states. But in developing our diplomatic relations, just as in our trade, cultural and other relations, we work according to principles, having regard, first of all, for the interests of our country and the revolution, contrary

to which we have never acted, and will never do so.

We Marxist-Leninists who have come to power have to establish diplomatic relations with the bourgeois-capitalist states, because these relations are in our interests, and theirs, too. These interests are reciprocal.

Marxist-Leninists should always remember principles. They cannot trample upon principles because of circumstances which are created in one period or another. We must keep in mind that in the countries where the upper strata of the bourgeoisie are ruling, they are permanently in struggle against the people, the proletariat and the poor peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie. Therefore, both when the socialist country maintains state relations with the bourgeois countries, and when it does not, it must make clear to the peoples that it supports their struggle, that it does not approve the reactionary, anti-popular actions of their rulers.

We Marxist-Leninists must recognize and bear in mind not only the contradictions which exist between the oppressed classes and their oppressors, but also the contradictions which arise between states, that is, between the governments of these countries and American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the other capitalist countries, etc. We must always pursue such a policy that we do not defend a reactionary govern-

ment simply because, for its own interests and those of the class in power, it breaks temporarily with American imperialism in order to throw itself into the lap of another imperialism, for example, British, Soviet, or some other imperialism. We must exploit the contradictions which exist among them with the aim that our stand assists the strengthening of the struggle of the proletariat and the oppressed masses of that country against its reactionary government. If contradictions have arisen between the reactionary and oppressive capitalist government of a country of the «second» or the «third world» and the government of a country of the «first world», according to the division made by the Chinese revisionists, it must not be taken for granted that these contradictions are always in favour of the liberation of the people of this country from the yoke of capital, the yoke of the reactionary bourgeosie ruling there. In this case we have to do mainly with bourgeois class interests, with the interests of governments which represent the exploiting classes, with the question of who gives more and who gives less, who best defends their being in power, and who wants to kick them out in order to bring in his own men.

In dealing with the struggle of the proletariat, the stand towards the bourgeoisie must not be confused with the diplomatic, trade, cultural and scientific relations between the socialist country

and states with another social system. These interstate relations are necessary and must be developed, but the socialist country should be clear about its aims in establishing them. The ideological, political, moral and material life of the socialist country must be a mirror for the peoples of those states with which it maintains relations, and in which, through the development of these relations, the peoples of the non-socialist states can see the blessings and advantages of the socialist system. Naturally, whether or not they follow the socialist road, is their affair, but it is the duty of the socialist country to set the good example.

On all these political, theoretical, and organizational problems not only are the Chinese leaders unclear but, far from clarifying them, they deliberately make them even more obscure, because, as Mao Tsetung says, we must stir things up in order to clarify them. This thesis is not correct. On the contrary, we must clarify things and convince people to carry out the revolution, because, as for turmoil, this exists already. If the question is to stir things up, then let us stir things up even more for imperialism, which is giving up the ghost, and not to help it and provide it with crutches to keep it going. We should cut short the existence of capitalism so that the peoples, the proletariat will be liberated and the prospect of socialism and communism will be brought nearer. This is our

revolutionary road, the road of Marxism-Leninism. There is no other road.

The Chinese leaders formerly used the expression, a «tit for tat» struggle against American imperialism, but they did not apply it then, and are certainly not applying it today. They are not waging a tit for tat struggle, since they are drawing closer to American imperialism and are in alliance with the United States of America.

China's diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with the imperialist states and the other states of the world are on a capitalist basis. China's objective in these relations is to strengthen its economic and military positions through the aid it wants to receive from the powerful imperialist states so that it, too, can compete with the other two superpowers. China's propaganda over the radio and by other means is designed to create the impression in the world not only that China is a big, powerful state with an ancient culture, but also that the present Chinese policy is progressive, indeed Marxist-Leninist. However, this activity of the Chinese revisionists does not and cannot by any means serve as an example which the peoples of the world should follow in their struggle to destroy the capitalist and imperialist power.

The Chinese View about the Unity of the «Third World» Is Reactionary

The Chinese leadership seeks the unity of all the countries of the «third world», which are heterogenous from any point of view: in regard to their economic, social and cultural development, the time needed and the road followed by each of them to win that degree of freedom and independence it enjoys today, etc.

But how does China imagine this unity it preaches? The Chinese leadership does not conceive this unity as achieved in the Marxist-Leninist way and in the interests of the revolution and the liberation of the peoples. It sees it from the bourgeois point of view, that is, as a unity by means of treaties and agreements concluded and rescinded by the rulers of these countries, who are linked with one imperialist power today, but who tomorrow may denounce the agreements they have themselves concluded in order to link up with another.

The Chinese revisionist leadership forgets that the unity of these national states can be ensured only through the struggle of the proletariat and the working masses of each particular country, in the first place, against the external imperialism which has penetrated into that country, but also against the internal capitalism and reaction.

Only on this basis can the unity of these countries be brought about. Only on this basis can the united front against foreign imperialism, as well as against the kings, the local reactionary bourgeoisie, feudal landlords and dictators, be achieved.

Under capitalism unity is realized only from above, at the top, in order to safeguard the victories of the bourgeoisie and to protect them from the revolution. Whereas genuine unity, a people's unity, must be achieved mainly from below, with the proletariat at the head of this unity.

Of course, the tactics which the proletariat of a country of the so-called third world, or the proletariat of all these countries may employ to unite with other political forces against imperialism cannot be rejected out of hand. The unity of the revolutionary forces even with the bourgeois leadership of a country, at a given moment, when a deep contradiction arises with a foreign imperialism or with a reactionary leadership of one of the countries of the «third world», cannot be neglected, either.

All these opportunities and possibilities must be seen and exploited by the revolutionary forces. That is why Lenin says that the aid of the socialist country and the international proletariat should be differentiated and conditional.

The Chinese leaders, however, advocate precisely an unconditional alliance among reactionary governments, allegedly to face up to imperialism.

And when they talk against imperialism, they do not mean imperialism is general, but only Soviet social-imperialism.

The weakening of imperialism and capitalism is the main trend of world history today. The efforts of various states to free themselves from the influence of imperialism also constitute another tendency which leads to the weakening of imperialism. But this second tendency, as the Chinese revisionist leadership absolutizes it unconditionally, without making any differentiation among countries, without studying the general and particular situations, does not lead to the correct course of the unity of the peoples in struggle to free themselves from imperialist interference and domination. Likewise, the view of the Chinese revisionists, who consider Europe a continent of «second world» countries, which they put in alliance with the «third world», cannot lead to the correct road, either. This grouping of capitalist states can never be for the general weakening of world capitalism. To say that such a thing can be achieved with the assistance and collaboration of the aristocratic bourgeoisie of Britain, the revanchist bourgeoisie of Western Germany, the cunning French bourgeoisie and the other big capitalist groups, is deplorable naivity.

The supporters of the theory of «three worlds» may claim that, by advocating the unity of these capitalist countries, they intend to weaken

imperialism. But which imperialism will this unity weaken? That imperialism with which the theory of «three worlds» calls for the creation of a united front against social-imperialism? That imperialism with which the capitalist countries of Europe are in alliance, despite their contradictions with it? Obviously, advocating the strengthening of this group of states is advocating strengthening the positions of US imperialism, strengthening the positions of the capitalist states of West Europe.

On the other hand, when the Chinese leadership talks about the creation of the alliance between the states of the «second world» and the states of the so-called third world, it means the alliance among the ruling circles of these countries. But to claim that these alliances will help the liberation of the peoples is an idealist, metaphysical, anti-Marxist view. Therefore, to deceive the broad masses of the peoples, who are seeking liberation, with such revisionist theories is a crime committed against the peoples and the revolution.

The Communist Party of China thinks that imperialism does not know, does not see, does not understand and does not exploit the contradictions which exist among the countries that have only just thrown off the yoke of colonialism and have fallen under the yoke of neo-colonialism. The facts show that imperialism exploits these contradictions continuously, every day, to its own advantage. It urges and incites these countries and

their peoples to fight one another, to split, to quarrel and fail to achieve unity even on certain specific problems.

Imperialism, too, is waging a life-and-death struggle, striving to prolong its existence and, when it sees that it cannot achieve this through the usual means, then it throws itself into open war and aggression to regain its superiority and hegemony.

The Chinese leaders want to unite the countries of the «third world» not only with one another, but also with the United States of America, against Soviet social-imperialism. In other words, the Chinese revisionists openly tell the peoples of the «third world» that Soviet social-imperialism is their main enemy, therefore, at the present time, they must not rise against US imperialism or against its ally, the reactionary bourgeoisie which is ruling in their own countries. According to the Chinese «theory», the states of the «third world» have to fight not to strengthen their freedom, independence and sovereignty, not for the revolution which overthrows the rule of the bourgeoisie, but for the status quo. It is understandable that, by advocating agreement with the United States of America, contrary to the interests of the revolution and the cause of national liberation, the Chinese revisionists are pushing these states into a treacherous compromise.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have

the internationalist duty to encourage and inspire the proletariat and the peoples of all these countries to make the revolution, to rise against foreign and local oppression and enslavement, in whatever form they present themselves. Our Party thinks that this is the only way that the conditions can be created for the peoples to fight both imperialism and social-imperialism, with which the capitalist bourgeoisie of most of these countries of the «third world» is linked in all sorts of ways.

But what does China do? China defends Mobutu and the clique around him in Zaire. Through its propaganda China is trying to create the impression that it is allegedly defending the people of that country against an invasion of mercenaries engineered by the Soviet Union, but in reality it is defending the reactionary Mobutu regime. The Mobutu clique is an agency in the service of US imperialism. Through its propaganda and «pro-Zaire» stand, China is defending Mobutu's alliance with US imperialism, with neocolonialism, and striving to prevent any change in the status quo of that country. The duty of the genuine revolutionaries is not to defend the reactionary rulers, the tools of the imperialists, but to work to inspire the people of Zaire to fight for their freedom and sovereignty against Mobutu, local capital and US, French, Belgian and other imperialisms.

Just as we are against Mobutu in Zaire, we are also against Neto and his abettors in Angola, because the Soviet Union and Neto are doing the same thing in Angola as the United States of America and Mobutu are doing in Zaire. From examination of the development of the situation in the above two states it is obvious how the rivalry between the superpowers over the division of colonies and markets is raging there. We defend neither Neto nor the Soviet Union, but while fighting them, we cannot support US imperialism and its mercenaries, enemies of the Angolan people. In any situation, under any circumstances and at any time, we must support the revolutionary peoples, and, in the case of Zaire and Angola, we must support only the peoples of these two countries in their efforts to throw off the yoke the superpowers are putting around their necks.

What should be recommended to the revolutionaries of Zaire? To make a compromise with Mobutu so that the people of this country will be even more oppressed by imperialism, as the Chinese revisionists advise? No, Marxist-Leninists cannot recommend this sort of compromise to the people of Zaire, or to any other people.

Let us take as an example China's policy in Pakistan. The Pakistan of the khans, where the rich bourgeoisie and the big latifundists have always ruled, has allegedly been an ally of China.

China's aid to this country has not been aid in the revolutionary direction. It has assisted the strengthening of Pakistan's reactionary latifundist bourgeoisie which savagely oppresses the people of that country, just as the clique of Nehru, Gandhi and the other reactionary magnates oppresses the Indian people. The government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was no exception. First, East Pakistan broke away from West Pakistan. India knew how to exploit the great contradictions which existed between the people of East Pakistan and the reactionary bourgeoisie ruling in West Pakistan. It fanned up these contradictions to the point of leading the people of East Pakistan into an insurrection against the Pakistan of Ali Bhutto. At that time in East Pakistan, which took the name of Bangladesh, the government of Mujibur Rahman, who allegedly fought for democracy and the interests of the people, was formed. But one morning Mujibur Rahman was murdered by elements closely linked with US imperialism. Now Ali Bhutto, too, has been toppled. Thus, China's friend and ally, Pakistan's greatest landowner and richest man, has been overthrown by other reactionaries in a coup d'état.

But what is this opposition which came to power, and who are those who take part in it? This, too, is a reactionary force, made up of the military-men, capitalists and big landowners. Impelled by their class interests and the links they,

too, have with the United States of America, the Soviet Union, or China, they are trying to keep the reactionary power firmly in their hands. In these conditions, to speak to the people of Pakistan about close alliance with and support for one or the other bourgeois political force, of replacing one clique of rulers with another, as the Chinese leaders are doing, is not showing them the correct course of the revolution. The correct course is to call on the people, caught between two fires, Bhutto's and his opponents', to kindle the powerful fire of the revolution, to stamp out the two former fires, to overthrow the two cliques of the same mould that exist in Pakistan. In this fight on two flanks the Pakistan people themselves will have to know how to utilize the contradictions.

The same applies to many countries of the so-called third world, or non-aligned world.

Thus the Chinese leadership is having no luck, not only in its alliances and friendship with the Marxist-Leninists, but also in its alliances with the bourgeois-capitalist states. But why is it having no luck? Because its policy is not Marxist-Leninist, because the analyses it makes and the deductions it draws from them are wrong. In these conditions, what trust can the peoples of the «third world» have in China, which is aiming to take these countries under its wing?

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Marxist-Leninist ideology, only socialism,

engender sincere love, close friendship and steel-like unity among the peoples, by eliminating everything which splits and divides them. In order to create unity and friendship among the peoples, to solve problems in the way that is best and most suitable to their interests, aid and concessions should in no way be granted to such degenerate bourgeois as Mobutu, Bhutto, Gandhi and others, allegedly for the sake of establishing a political equilibrium which is an expression of the anti-scientific, anti-popular and opportunist theory of «equilibrium», which serves to maintain the status quo and slavery.

We Marxist-Leninists fight against neo-colonialism, against the oppressive capitalist bourgeoisie of any country, that is, against those who oppress the peoples. This struggle can be waged if the genuine communist parties inspire, organize and lead the proletariat and the working masses. Leadership of the proletariat and the masses by the party is successfully achieved only when the party has a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary inspiration, and not an equivocal inspiration with a hundred meanings, with a hundred flags. In its actions the Marxist-Leninist party of the genuine socialist country does not proceed only from the interest of its own state, but always takes account of the interest of the world revolution, too.

The Chinese Theory of the «Third World» and the Yugoslav Theory of the «Non-aligned World» Sabotage the Revolutionary Struggle of the Peoples

All the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet, Titoite, Chinese and other modern revisionists, are doing their utmost to fight Marxism-Leninism, the triumphant theory of the proletariat. Our Party's exposure of the theory of «three worlds» has put the Chinese revisionists in a difficult position, because they are unable to reply to our opposition and exposure theoretically, and this is not because they are afraid of us, but because they are afraid of their lack of arguments.

Mao Tsetung and Teng Hsiao-ping, who enunciated or adopted the notion of the «third world», did not want to support this theory with theoretical argument, for they could not, and this was not without a purpose. Why did they not do this? This «oversight» of theirs is a trick and its aim is to deceive people, to make them accept an absurd thesis without discussion, simply because Mao Tsetung produced it. Mao Tsetung could not explain the theoretical basis of this «philosophical» or «political» notion, because there is no way it can be explained. He and his disciples propagate their concept of the division of the

world into three simply by proclaiming it, but without defending it, because they themselves know that this thesis is indefensible.

The Chinese «third world» and the Yugoslav «non-aligned world» are almost one and the same thing. The aim of both of these «worlds» is to provide a theoretical justification for extinguishing the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and to assist the big imperialist and capitalist powers to preserve and perpetuate the bourgeois system of oppression and exploitation.

As a false, anti-Marxist theory, totally devoid of any theoretical basis, the theory of the «third world», the myth the Chinese revisionists have created around it, has no effect at all, either on the broad masses of the proletariat and the suffering peoples in the countries of the «third world», or on the leaders of these countries. These leaders, whom the Chinese leadership is trying to take under its umbrella, have their own deeply implanted views, have their own ideology and definite orientations, therefore the Chinese tales do not go down with them. Teng Hsiao-ping and company think that China with its vast territory and population can impose itself on these countries. To a certain degree, and as long as it does not jeopardize its plans, the Chinese theory of «three worlds» suits American imperialism. This theory fosters the creation of confused situations in the world of which both American imperialism and

Soviet social-imperialism take advantage to extend their own hegemony, to link together and enter into more alliances and agreements with the capitalist and bourgeois landowner heads of the countries of the so-called third world and make them even tighter. This situation also serves the social-imperialist aims of the Chinese revisionists.

In regard to the theory of the «non-aligned world», the Yugoslav revisionists raise it to a universal theory which is supposed to replace the Marxist-Leninist theory which, in their view, has become «obsolete», is no longer «relevant», because the peoples and the world have allegedly changed. They do not denounce Marxism-Leninism openly, as Carrillo does, but they fight it by defending their theory of the «non-aligned world», whereas those who defend Marxism-Leninism, according to the Yugoslav revisionists, always repeat the same «mistake», they do not agree that the principles and norms of this revolutionary doctrine must be corrected, hence they are «recidivists». According to them, the Party of Labour of Albania (which is the target of their attack) is a «recidivist» party because it wants to apply the scientific principles, methods and doctrine of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin to «a world entirely different from that of their time».

The Titoite views are totally anti-Marxist. And the analysis they make of the process of

world development today proceeds from these positions. Modern revisionism, in general, and Yugoslav and Chinese revisionism, in particular, are against the revolution. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists consider American imperialism a powerful force which can adopt a more logical course, can «help» the present world which, according to them, is developing and does not want to be aligned. But the Yugoslav theory is unable to make a proper definition of the term «non-aligned» itself. From what point of view are the countries it includes in this world it advocates non-aligned, politically, ideologically, economically or militarily? The Yugoslav pseudo-Marxist theory does not touch on or mention this question, because all these countries, which it is seeking to lead under the guise of a new world, cannot extricate themselves from their many and various forms of dependence on American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism.

The Yugoslav «theory» makes great play with the fact that now the colonialism of the old type has been abolished, in general, but it does not say that many peoples have fallen into the clutches of the new colonialism. We Marxist-Leninists do not deny the fact that colonialism in the old forms has been abolished, but we stress that it has been replaced by neo-colonialism. The same colonialists of yesterday are still oppressing the peoples today, through their economic and military potential,

and disorganizing them politically and ideologically by introducing their corrupt way of life. The Titoites call such a situation a great transformation of the world and add that neither Marx nor Lenin, let alone Stalin, whom they reject altogether, conceived such a possibility. According to them, the peoples are now free, independent, and aspire only to non-alignment, while the wealth of the world should be divided in a more rational and just manner.

For this «aspiration» to be realized, the Yugoslav «theoreticians» ask the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists and the developed capitalist countries, out of the kindness of their hearts to contribute, through international conferences, debates, and the concessions which the countries will make to one another, to the transformation of the present world, which they say, «has reached such a level of consciousness as to be able to go to socialism».

This is the «socialism» the Titoite revisionist preach, a sermon they encourage to distract the peoples as much as possible from the reality. Being against the revolution, they are for the preservation of social peace so that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can reach agreement on the «improvement of the living standard of the lower classes». That is, they humbly beg the upper classes to become «generous» and hand out some-

thing from their profits to the «wretched of the earth».

Tito wants to turn the theory of the «non-aligned world» «into a universal doctrine», which, as we mentioned above, allegedly suits the «situation in the world today». The peoples of the world have awakened and want to live free, but according to Tito's theory, this «freedom» is not «complete» now because of the existence of the two blocs, the NATO bloc and the Warsaw bloc.

Tito poses as the leading figure and standard-bearer of the anti-bloc policy. It is true that his country is not a member of NATO or the Warsaw Treaty, but it is linked with these military organizations by many threads. The Yugoslav economy and policy are not independent, they are conditioned by the credits, aid and loans they receive from the capitalist countries and, first of all, from American imperialism. That is why he relies mostly on this imperialism. However, Tito also relies on Soviet imperialism and all other big capitalist powers. So Yugoslavia, which claims to be non-aligned is aligned, *de facto* if not *de jure,* with the aggressive organizations of the superpowers.

There are many leaders in various countries of the world like Tito, whom he wants to gather together in the so-called non-aligned world. These personalities, in general, are bourgeois, capitalist, non-Marxist, many of whom are fighting the rev-

olution. The labels socialist, democrat, social-democrat, republican, independent republican, etc., that some of these personalities assume, in most cases serve to deceive the proletariat and the oppressed people, in order to keep them in bondage, and play politics at their expense.

Anti-Marxist capitalist ideology prevails in the «non-aligned» states. Many of these states have links and entanglements with the superpowers and all the developed capitalist countries of the world in the same way as Titoite Yugoslavia. The only basis for the grouping in the «non-aligned world», under Tito's leadership, which he advocates for all countries of the world, is the aim and activity to quell the revolution, to stop the proletariat and peoples from rising in insurrection to overthrow the old capitalist society and establish the new society, socialism.

This is the idea and the main principle which guides Tito in bringing these countries together. He pretends that he has managed to group them together and assume the leadership of them, but in fact, no such thing exists, as nobody gives the Titoite theory of the «non-aligned world», or the Chinese theory of «three worlds», the importance which their standard-bearers desire and strive for. Everybody goes his own way on the road that brings him the greatest and most immediate gains.

All the indications show that American imperialism and world capitalism prefer the «non-align-

ed world» of Tito rather than the «third world» of the Chinese. Although they support the Chinese theory of «three worlds», the developed capitalist countries and American imperialism are, however, a bit wary and hesitant, because the strengthening of China may lead to undesirable situations and eventually become dangerous to the Americans themselves. Whereas the «non-aligned world» of Tito poses no danger at all to the United States of America. That is why, during Tito's last visit to the United States of America, Carter extolled his role in creating the «non-aligned world» and described the movement of the «non-aligned countries» as «a very important factor in solving the major problems of the present-day world».

The «non-aligned countries», most of which are capitalist countries, have cast the dice. They know how to manoeuvre in politics, and they side with those imperialist and capitalist powers which give them most aid. According to the bourgeois and capitalist view, to engage in politics means to deceive, to trick, to outwit the others as heavily and as often as possible. This policy is a policy of prostitution, which, in certain moments and according to passing circumstances, is aimed at getting at least a little hard cash from a more powerful state in the interest of one's class, in the interest of the bosses of this class.

Titoism, with its theory of the «non-aligned

world», preaches precisely this policy. But it does not have the same orientation everywhere, as Tito makes out. The «non-aligned» states do not consult Tito as to what they should do and how they should act. With a few exceptions, the rulers of these states are trying to consolidate their capitalist power, to exploit the people, to be on friendly terms with a big imperialist country, to prevent or suppress the outburst of any people's revolt and insurrection, any revolution. This is the whole policy of the Titoite «non-aligned world».

The Chinese theory of the «third world» is also for the status quo. The purpose of the Titoite «non-aligned world» is to beg credits from American imperialism and the other capitalist countries to enrich the bourgeois class and keep it in power. With its theory of the «third world», China, too, wants to enrich itself, to strengthen itself economically and militarily in order to become a superpower, to dominate the world. The aims of both these «worlds» are anti-Marxist. They are pro-capital, pro-American imperialism.

As Tito's visit to China and Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Yugoslavia showed, the Yugoslav revisionists are lavishing praises and cunning flattery on China, well-adapted to the character of the Chinese revisionists and intended to lure them to the Yugoslav positions, so that the theory of the «non-aligned countries» will find not only understanding, but also complete acceptance in Peking. Al-

though they do not renounce their theory of the «third world», the Chinese revisionist leaders, headed by Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping, have come out in open support of the Titoite theory of the «non-aligned world». They have demonstrated that they want to work closely with the Yugoslav revisionists along the same lines, on two parallel rails, with the anti-Marxist common aim of deceiving the peoples of the «third world». The Yugoslav leaders are now elaborating these views in defence of China. In defending it, however, they have raised some «arguments» which are offensive to China, as the megalomaniac state it is. The Titoites come out in support of China and defend it against the exposure which our Party makes of the Chinese leadership, by saying that China's present policy is allegedly realistic.

China, say the Yugoslavs, is a big country, which from its very nature has to be developed, as it is still backward, a developing country. The Marxist-Leninist parties, such as the Party of Labour of Albania, are wrong, the Titoites claim, when they attack China over its just aspirations to development and non-alignment, over the aid it gives national liberation wars, etc., etc. Yugoslavia has the ambition to make China one of its satellites. For the Yugoslav revisionists the important thing is that China should adopt their anti-Marxist views without any hesitation.

With the theory of the «non-aligned world»,

Yugoslavia, with Tito at the head, has always faithfully served American imperialism. Tito and his group are performing this kind of service now, too, by trying to push China towards rapprochement and alliance with the United States of America. This was the main aim of Tito's going to Peking and of his talks there, which resulted in a close friendship, which, with Hua Kuo-feng's visit to Yugoslavia, has taken the form of wide-ranging collaboration, not only between the two states, but also between the two parties. During Tito's visit to Peking, the Chinese leaders half admitted that the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was a Marxist-Leninist party and that genuine socialism was being built in Yugoslavia. When Hua Kuo-feng went to Belgrade, they stated this completely and officially.

In other words, the Maoists have done just what Mikoyan and Khrushchev did in their time, when they gave Tito full recognition as a «Marxist», and declared that «socialism is being built in Yugoslavia» and that the «Communist Party of Yugoslavia is a Marxist-Leninist party».

The United States of America pulls either the Tito string, or the Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping strings, according to its wishes. This pair are marionettes which do not come out openly on the stages of children's theatres, but remain in disguise and, when their theories are attacked and they find no facts to back their arguments,

they declare that «they do not engage in polemics»! Why do they not engage in polemics with socialist Albania, when it and the Marxist-Leninist Party of Labour expose them badly before world opinion? What are they waiting for? They do not engage in polemics because they fear that their treacherous game against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution will be exposed. When the Chinese leaders, through the Yugoslavs and others, say that China will not reply to the Albanian polemics, their purpose is to cover up the truth.

The United States of America, the Soviet Union and other capitalist countries are continually holding various bilateral, or multilateral meetings, all kinds of conferences, congresses, adopting resolutions, making speeches and organizing press conferences, telling many lies and spreading false hopes, making threats and resorting to blackmail. All these things are being done to get out of the crisis in which they are bogged down, to suppress the feelings of revenge of the suffering oppressed peoples, to outwit the broad working masses and the proletariat, and deceive the progressive democrats. The Yugoslav and Chinese revisionists, too, are playing their cards in all this devious and filthy game.

The theory of the «developing world» is also one of the cards of this game which has the same anti-Marxist aim of befuddling people's minds.

This theory makes no mention of political problems because to do so would be in vain. Only the «economic problem» and the «problem of development» in general exist for this theory. But what kind of development the theory of the «developing world» is after, this nobody defines. Naturally, the various countries of the world want to develop in the economic, political, cultural, and all other fields. The peoples of the world, with the proletariat at the head, want to overthrow the old, rotten, bourgeois capitalist world and build the new world, socialism, in its place. But the theories of the «non-aligned world» and the «developing world» make no mention of this world.

When we Marxist-Leninists speak of the various countries, we also give our opinions of them, make assessments of the level of development of one country or the other, of the possibilities of each state to develop in this direction. We say that the people of each country must carry out the revolution and build the new society, relying on their own forces. We say that in order to be free, independent and sovereign, every state must build a new society, must fight and overthrow its oppressors, must fight any imperialism which enslaves it, must gain and defend its political, economic and cultural rights, and build a completely free, completely independent homeland where the working class must rule in alliance with all the working masses. This is what we say and we are

resolute defenders of the Leninist thesis about two worlds. We are members of the new socialist world and we are fighting the old capitalist world to the death.

All other «theories» which divide the world into the «first world», «second world», «third world», «non-aligned world», «developing world», or any other «world» which may be invented in the future, serve capitalism, serve the hegemony of the great powers, serve their aims of keeping the peoples in bondage. This is why we combat these reactionary anti-Marxist theories with all our strength.

The whole world and, especially, the countries of the so-called third world, non-aligned world, or developing world are following the struggle of our Party with sympathy. In our Marxist-Leninist views, in the ideological and political stand of our Party, the peoples of these countries whom the Chinese, Titoite and Soviet revisionist theories, and the theories of American imperialism, etc., are intended to deceive, see a correct stand which corresponds to the correct course for their liberation from oppression and exploitation once and for all.

Precisely because of this the enemies of Marxism-Leninism and our Party try to level the accusation at us that we are sectarian, ultra-leftist, Blanquist, that we do not make a correct analysis of the international situation but stick to some

outmoded schemata, etc. It is clear that they are referring to our revolutionary doctrine, which they call «Marxist-Leninist schematism», «Stalinist schematism», etc.

They accuse us of allegedly calling on the countries which have escaped from the form of exploitation by old colonialism and which have entered the form of exploitation of the new colonialism, to go over immediately to socialism, to carry out the proletarian revolution immediately. They think they are striking a blow at us with this, by presenting us as adventurers. But our Party stands loyal to the Marxist-Leninist theory, the theory which has correctly defined the road of the revolution, the stages this revolution must go through, and the conditions which must be fulfilled for this revolution, either national-democratic and anti-imperialist or socialist, to be carried out successfully. We stood loyal to this theory during our Anti-fascist National Liberation War, we are standing loyal to it now, in the construction of socialism, we stand loyal to it in our ideological struggle and foreign policy. Our analysis is correct, therefore no calumny can shake it.

II

CHINA'S PLAN TO BECOME A SUPERPOWER

In the beginning, while analysing the global strategy of US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism for world domination, while analysing the emergence and development of the different variants of modern revisionism, as well as the struggle of all these enemies against Marxism-Leninism and the revolution, we also dwelt on the place and strategy of Chinese revisionism.

China styles its political line Marxist-Leninist, but the reality shows the opposite. It is precisely the true nature of this line that we Marxist-Leninists must lay bare. We must not allow the Chinese revisionist theories to pass for Marxist theories, we must not allow China, on the course it has adopted, to pose as if it is fighting for the revolution, whereas in reality it is against it.

With the policy China is pursuing, it is becoming even more obvious that it is trying to

strengthen the positions of capitalism at home and to establish its hegemony in the world, to become a great imperialist power, so that it, too, occupies, so to say, the «place it deserves».

History shows that every big capitalist country aims to become a great world power, to overtake and surpass the other great powers, and compete with them for world domination. The roads the big bourgeois states have followed to turn into imperialist powers have been various; they have been conditioned by definite historical and geographical circumstances, by the development of the productive forces, etc. The road of the United States of America is different from that followed by the old European powers like Britain, France and Germany, which were formed as such on the basis of colonial occupations.

After the Second World War, the United States of America was left the greatest capitalist power. On the basis of the great economic and military potential it possessed, and through the development of neo-colonialism, it was transformed into an imperialist superpower. But before long another superpower was added to this, the Soviet Union, which after Stalin's death and after the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the Khrushchevite leadership, was transformed into an imperialist superpower. For this purpose it exploited the great economic, technical and military potential built up by socialism.

We are now witnessing the efforts of another big state, today's China, to become a superpower because it, too, is proceeding rapidly on the road of capitalism. But China lacks colonies, lacks a large-scale developed industry, lacks a strong economy in general, and a great thermo-nuclear potential on the same scale as the other two imperialist superpowers.

To become a superpower it is absolutely essential to have a developed economy, an army equipped with atomic bombs, to ensure markets and spheres of influence, investment of capital in foreign countries, etc. China is bent on ensuring these conditions as quickly as possible. This was expressed in Chou En-lai's speech in the People's Assembly in 1975 and was repeated at the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China, where it was proclaimed that, before the end of this century, China will become a powerful modern country, with the objective of catching up with the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Now this whole plan has been extended and set out in precise detail in what is called the policy of the «four modernizations».

But what road has China chosen so that it, too, will become a superpower? At present, the colonies and markets in the world are occupied by others. The creation of an economic and military potential equal to that of the Americans and Soviets, within 20 years, and with their own forces,

as the Chinese leaders claim they will do, is impossible.

In these conditions, in order to become a superpower, China will have to go through two main phases: first, it must seek credits and investments from US imperialism and the other developed capitalist countries, purchase new technology in order to exploit its local wealth, a great part of which will go as dividends for the creditors. Second, it will invest the surplus value extracted at the expense of the Chinese people in states of various continents, just as the US imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists are doing today.

China's efforts to become a superpower are based, in the first place, on its choice of allies and the creation of alliances. Two superpowers exist in the world today, US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. **The Chinese leaders worked out that they must rely on US imperialism, on which they have pinned great hopes of getting assistance in the fields of the economy, finance, technology and organization, as well as in the military field.** In fact, the economic-military potential of the United States of America is greater than that of Soviet social-imperialism. This the Chinese revisionists know well, though they say that America is declining. On the course which they are following, they cannot rely on a weak

partner, from which they cannot gain much. Precisely because it is powerful, they have chosen the United States of America to be their ally.

The alliance with the United States of America and the accommodation of the Chinese policy to the policy of US imperialism also has other aims. It contains in itself the threat against Soviet social-imperialism, which is plain from the deafening propaganda and the feverish activity the Chinese leaders are carrying out against the Soviet Union. With this policy it is pursuing, China is letting the revisionist Soviet Union know that its links with the United States of America constitute a colossal force against it, in case an imperialist war breaks out.

The present-day Chinese policy is also aimed at establishing friendships and alliances with all the other developed capitalist countries, from which it seeks political and economic benefits. China wants and is trying to strengthen the US alliance with these countries of the «second world», as it calls them. It is encouraging their unity with, or more accurately, their subjection to, US imperialism, which it regards as its senior partner.

This is the explanation for all those close links that the Chinese government is bent on establishing with all the wealthy capitalist states, Japan, West Germany, Britain, France, etc., this is

the explanation for the frequent visits to China of government economic, cultural and scientific delegations from the United States of America and all the other developed capitalist countries, whether republics or kingdoms, as well as the visits of the Chinese delegations to those countries. This is the explanation for China's systematic actions to demonstrate its stand in favour of the United States of America and the other industrialized capitalist states at every opportunity, by trying to bring to notice everything that is written, said and done in these states against Soviet social-imperialism.

This policy of the Chinese leaders cannot fail to attract attention and find due support from the United States of America. As is known, at the time of the Second World War in the American State Department there were two lobbies over the Chinese issue: one pro Chiang Kai-shek and the other pro Mao Tsetung. Of course, at that time the Chiang Kai-shek lobby triumphed in the American State Department and Senate, while the Mao Tsetung lobby triumphed on the spot, in mainland China. Among the inspirers of this lobby were Marshall and Vandemeyer, Edgar Snow and others, who became friends and advisers of the Chinese, the instigators and inspirers of all kinds of organizations in new China. Today the threads of those old ties are being revived, strengthened, intensified and materialized. Now everybody sees

that China and the United States of America are drawing ever closer to each other. Some time ago, one of the best-informed American newspapers, «The Washington Post» wrote: «There is now an American consensus which is supported even by the Right, even by those who have little sympathy for Peking. According to this consensus, whatever might have happened in the past, there is no longer any reason for China to be considered a threat to the United States of America. Except for Taiwan, there are few things on which the two governments are not in agreement. In fact, both sides have agreed to put aside the Taiwan question with the aim of gaining advantage in other fields».

The issue of Taiwan which is raised in the relations between China and the United States of America, has remained something formal. China is not insisting on this question now. It is not worried about Hong-Kong and is not in the least concerned that Macao is still under the domination of the Portuguese. The Chinese government does not accept the offer of the new Portuguese government to restore this colony to China, saying that «a gift is not taken back». The existence of these colonies is an anachronism, but this does not upset the pragmatic policy of the Chinese leaders. So long as Hong-Kong and Macao remain colonies, why should Taiwan, too, not be a colony? Apparently China is greatly interested

that Taiwan should remain as it is in the future, too. Besides its open relations it carries on in the light of the day, it is interested in developing its disguised trafficking with the American imperialists, the British, Japanese and other imperialists, through these three doors. Therefore, the nonsense Teng Hsiao-ping and Li Hsien-nien try to put across that Sino-American relations allegedly depend on the stand of the Americans towards Taiwan, is nothing but a smoke-screen to conceal the course on which China has set out towards rapprochement with the United States of America in order to become a superpower.

Carter has declared that the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with China. As far as Taiwan is concerned, it will adopt Japan's stand, i.e., formally it will break off diplomatic relations with the island, without breaking off economic and cultural relations, and under cover of them, military relations. In fact, China is interested in the military relations of the United States of America with Taiwan. It wants the United States of America to maintain forces in Taiwan, Japan, South Korea and the Indian Ocean, because it thinks that this is to China's advantage, for thus a counter-weight is created against the Soviet Union.

All these stands are connected with the course the Chinese leadership has chosen for China to become a superpower, by trying to develop its eco-

nomy and increase its military potential through credits and investments from the United States of America and other big capitalist countries. It justifies this course by claiming that it is allegedly applying a correct policy, the «Marxist» line of Mao Tsetung, according to whom «China ought to benefit from the world's great successes, new patents and technologies, making foreign things serve its internal development», etc. The articles of «Renmin Ribao» and the speeches of the Chinese leaders are full of such slogans. According to the Chinese concept, to benefit from the inventions and industrial achievements of other states means to take credits and accept investments from the United States of America, Japan, West Germany, France, Britain and all the other capitalist countries, for which it is lavish with praise.

The Chinese leaders have adopted the revisionist theories that big countries such as China, which have many assets, can take credits from American imperialism or any powerful capitalist state, trust or bank, because they allegedly have the possibilities to repay the credits. The Yugoslav revisionists have come out in defence of this view. By advertising their experience of the «construction of specific socialism» with aid from the world financial oligarchy and especially US capital, they are providing the example and encouraging China to proceed on this course without hesitation.

The big countries may repay the credits they receive, but the imperialist investments which are made in these big states, such as the revisionist Soviet Union, China, or anywhere else, cannot fail to leave grave neo-colonialist consequences. The wealth and toil of the peoples are exploited also in the interest of the foreign capitalist concerns and monopolies. The American imperialists, as well as the developed capitalist states of Western Europe or Japan, which are making investments in China and in the revisionist countries, intend to dig themselves in there, to interlock the concerns of their countries in close collaboration with the trusts and branches of the main industries in these countries.

The question of capital investment by imperialist states in China is not so simple as the revisionists strive to make out when they call this penetration of capital into their countries harmless because, allegedly, it is not coming in through interstate relations (although top Chinese leaders have recently declared that they will accept government credits from abroad), but through private banks and companies without political implications and interests. The incurring of heavy debts by any country, big or small, to one imperialism or another, is always fraught with unavoidable dangers to the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the country which embarks on this

course, especially of economically poor countries such as China. A true socialist country has no need to incur such debts. It finds the resources for its economic development at home, in its wealth, in its internal accumulation and in the creative force of the people. The example of Albania, a small country, shows very clearly what inexhaustible means, resources and capacities a socialist country has for its development. And the means and resources of a big country are much greater still, if it marches consistently on the road of Marxism-Leninism.

The opening up of the Chinese market to American imperialism and the big American and other Western companies has been welcomed with unrestrained delight by the imperialists of the United States of America and all the international bourgeoisie. The multinational companies, the industrialists of the United States of America, have a good knowledge of China's economy and its great assets, therefore they are doing their utmost to build up their economic network there, to set up joint companies and extract large profits. Not only the big American companies but also the companies of Japan, Germany and the other developed capitalist countries are operating in China in this way.

China has already concluded a contract with Japan for the delivery of up to 10 million tons of oil per year. A big team of representatives of

the Italian ENI went to China to offer licences for oil prospecting instruments there, but they found themselves forstalled by large groups from the American oil companies which had earlier entered into agreements with China on the joint extraction and exploitation of oil. This is what China is doing also in other mining sectors like iron and other minerals, large resources of which are already known or may be discovered there. The German coal magnates are now in China and have concluded contracts worth scores of billions of marks. Chinese ministers are going back and forth to Japan, America and Europe in order to get credits, to sign contracts for modern technological equipment, to buy modern weapons, to conclude technical-scientific agreements, etc. The doors of all Chinese institutions and enterprises have been opened to the businessmen from Tokyo, Wall-Street and the European Common Market, who are hurrying to Peking, vying with one another to secure contracts for the large «modernization» projects the Chinese government is offering them. In this way China, too, is entering the whirlpool of imperialist greed, the great imperialist hunger for minerals and raw materials, and the exploitation of Chinese labour power.

Everyone knows that the capitalist does not give anyone aid without first considering his own economic, political and ideological interests. It is

not simply a question of the percentage of profit he makes. Along with the credit it gives, the capitalist country also introduces its way of life, its capitalist way of thinking, into the country which receives its «aid», it sets up bases and spreads out insidiously, like oil in cabbage, expands its spider's web with the spider always there in the centre, ready to suck the blood of all the flies which become entangled in its web, as has happened with Yugoslavia and is happening now with the Soviet Union. The same will happen with China, too.

Consequently, China will give way, as it is doing already, on political and ideological questions, and the Chinese market will become a very important *debouché** for American imperialism and the other industrialized capitalist powers.

The American, West-German, Japanese and other credits and investments in China cannot fail to affect its independence and sovereignty to one degree or another. Such credits make every recipient state dependent, for the lender imposes his own policy on it. Therefore, any state, big or small, which gets caught up in the mechanism of imperialism suffers curtailment or loss of its political freedom, its independence and sovereignty. Even the Soviet Union has been reduced to this state of curtailed sovereignty, although when

* French in the original.

it embarked on the course of the restoration of capitalism, it was far more powerful economically and militarily than present-day China, which is setting out on the same course.

Naturally, when they get themselves caught up in the mechanism of imperialism, the small countries loose their freedom and independence more quickly than big countries like China and the Soviet Union, which may lose them more gradually, not only because they have greater economic and military potential, but also because, relying on this potential, they struggle to protect their markets and seize new ones, to create and expand their spheres of influence in order to bring pressure to bear upon one another, and even go to war when they find no other way out. But still this does not save them from the chains of the credits and investments which bind them hand and foot. The credits must be repaid with interest. However, when you are unable to pay them, you will incur new debts. Debts pile up and the capitalist demands his payment and when you cannot pay he will put the pressure on you. The American monopoly companies, for example, which impose their policy on the government, force it to protect their capital by every means, even to declare war, if need be, to defend them.

Judging by the zeal the Chinese leaders are displaying in their attempts to base themselves on American imperialism, on the capitalists of the

United States of America, for the development of the economy of their country, all their deafening clamour about the weakening of this imperialism falls flat. Their allegations about the weakening of American imperialism are only a bluff, like their declaration about relying on their own forces. The Chinese revisionists think the opposite of what they say, as everybody can see from their practice.

The official Chinese newspapers often voice their concern about the credits the social-imperialist Soviet Union receives from the American, West-German, Japanese and other banks. They warn the United States of America and the other developed capitalist countries to be careful because the Soviet Union uses the technological assistance and credits they provide to develop and strengthen its economic and military potential, and that this aid and these credits increase the danger threatening them from social-imperialism, which, according to the Chinese leaders, today has taken the place of the Third Reich. Therefore, they call for these credits to be cut off as soon as possible. The Chinese press speaks in the same terms as Strauss, the notorious West-German nazi and revanchist.

It is not difficult to deduce the real meaning of the «concern» which the Chinese leaders display about the credits which the Soviet Union receives. Naturally, they are not worried about the

capitalist nature of these credits, nor about the danger they pose to the sovereignty of the Soviet state. But they want to tell the magnates of American capital and the government of the United States of America, the capitalists and the governments of the other imperialist countries, that they must give these credits and this aid not to the Soviet Union, but to China, which is no source of danger to them, but a source of profits.

This is one aspect of the Chinese plan to become a superpower. **The other aspect is the attempts to dominate the less developed countries of the world, to become the leader* of what China calls the «third world».**

The group ruling today in China lays great stress on the «third world» in which, not fortuitously and not without a purpose, it includes China, too. The «third world» of the Chinese revisionists has a well-defined political aim. It is part of the strategy which aims at transforming China into a superpower as quickly as possible. China wants to rally round itself all the countries of the «third world» or the «non-aligned» countries or the «developing countries», in order to create a large force, which will not only increase the overall Chinese potential but will also help China to counterpose itself to the other two superpowers,

* English in the original.

the United States of America and the Soviet Union, to carry greater weight in the bargaining over the division of markets and spheres of influence, to gain the true status of an imperialist superpower. China is trying to realize its aim of rallying as many states of the world as possible round itself under the slogan that it is allegedly for the liberation of the peoples from neo-colonialism and their transition to socialism through the struggle against imperialism. China speaks about this imperialism somewhat in the abstract but it emphasizes that Soviet imperialism is the most dangerous.

China has launched this demagogic slogan, devoid of any theoretical content, in the hope of using it as a means to realize its hegemonic aims. As a start, it intends to establish Chinese domination over the so-called third world and then to manipulate this «world» for its own imperialist interests. For the time being, China is trying to conceal this with its reputation as a socialist country. It is speculating with the assumption that a socialist country could have no intentions of enslaving or leading others by the nose, of blackmailing, fighting, oppressing and exploiting them. It is using this slogan and backing it up with the reputation that the Communist Party of China, created by the «great» Mao Tsetung, is allegedly a Marxist-Leninist party which faithfully adheres to the theory of Marx and Lenin, a theory which is

against all the evils of the capitalist system, colonial exploitation, etc.

Disguised as something which it is not, hiding behind the phrase the «third world», and including itself without any criterion or class definition in this «world», China thinks that it will more easily realize its strategic aim of establishing its hegemony over this world. The Soviet Union has practised the same deception on other countries. All the Khrushchevite revisionists prate night and day that they are «communists» and that their parties are «genuine Marxist-Leninist parties». The Soviet revisionists, also, are trying to establish their hegemony over the world under this disguise. Consequently, we may say that there is no essential difference between the actions of the Chinese and those of Soviet social-imperialists.

All this development of the Chinese policy and actions fully confirms the description Marxism-Leninism gives of imperialism as the domination of the financial oligarchy which is bent on capturing markets, dominating the world and establishing its hegemony everywhere. On this road, China too is trying to penetrate and get a «foothold» in the countries of the «third world». But this «foothold» has to be gained through great sacrifices.

To penetrate the «third world», to capture markets, requires capital. The ruling classes in power in the countries of the «third world» want

investments, credits and «aid». However, China is not in a position to give them «aid» on a large scale, because it does not have the necessary economic potential. It is precisely this potential that it is now trying to build up with the aid of American imperialism. In these conditions, the bourgeoisie ruling in the countries of the «third world» is well aware that, for the time being, it cannot gain much from China economically, technologically, or militarily. It can gain more from American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism which have great economic, technical and military potential.

However, like every country with imperialist aims, China is fighting and will fight harder still for markets in the world. It is striving and will strive harder still to spread its influence and extend its domination. These plans are apparent even now. China is opening its own banks, not only in Hong Kong, where it has had them for a long time, but also in Europe and elsewhere. It will strive especially to open banks in and export capital to the countries of the «third world». For the present it is doing very little in this field. China's «aid» amounts to the building of some cement factory, railway, or hospital, for its possibilities are limited. Only when the American, Japanese and other investments in China begin to yield the fruits it desires, that is, when its economy, trade and military technology are developed, will China

be able to embark on a venture of real large-scale economic and military expansion. But to achieve this, time is needed.

Until that time it will have to manoeuvre, as it has begun doing already, by means of a policy of «aid» and credits either interest-free or at low rates of interest, at a time when the Soviets and Americans are demanding much higher interest rates. As long as Chinese capital cannot flow out of its country, the revisionist Chinese leadership will focus its attention on the propaganda aspect of the small amount of «aid» and credits it accords the «developing countries», extolling its «internationalist character» and «disinterested aims», accompanying this with the motto of «self-reliance» for the liberation and construction of one's country.

The more China develops economically and militarily, the more it will want to penetrate into and dominate the small and less developed countries by means of its exports of capital, and then it will no longer charge a 1-2 percent interest for its credits, but will act like all the others.

But all these plans and efforts cannot be carried out easily. The developed imperialist and capitalist countries, which have influence in the countries of the so-called third world, will not allow China to capture the markets they conquered long ago through predatory wars, so easily. Not only are they strongly defending their old posi-

tions but they are also trying in every way to capture new ones, and are not allowing China to lay its hand on these countries.

Imperialism is ruthless towards any of its partners, when it is in difficulties or when it is flourishing. Sometimes, from necessity and in order to make greater profits, it may make some concession, but mostly it tries to reinforce its chains, not only against weak countries, but also against the developed ones, like the industrialized capitalist states. For example, the United States of America has always pursued this policy towards its capitalist allies, when they have found themselves in difficulties in the imperialist wars that have broken out amongst them. But even after these wars, when they have been making efforts to recover, American imperialism has done its utmost to prevent them from penetrating into the other countries of the world, where it had established its domination. Thus, after the Second World War, the United States of America, while pretending to assist Britain and France, which had emerged from the war weakened, penetrated deeply into the markets of the sterling, franc and other areas. The American monopolies and cartels of metallurgy, chemicals, transport and many other branches of vital importance for the development of capitalism, penetrated the monopolies and cartels of Britain, France, etc., in overwhelming proportions, making these countries subservient to Amer-

ican imperialism. This savage and insatiable imperialism, as any other imperialism, cannot act otherwise with China, either.

Taking account of the difficulties of economic and military penetration into the countries of the «third world», China thinks that its hegemony over them may be secured by establishing its political and ideological influence. It thinks that this will be attained by operating in three directions: to refrain from fighting American imperialism and the ruling cliques in the capitalist counties, to enter into alliance with this imperialism and these cliques instead; to combat Soviet social-imperialism which it has on its borders, in order to weaken and destroy its bases in Asia, Africa and Latin America; to deceive the proletariat and the long-suffering peoples of these continents by means of pseudo-revolutionary and pseudo-socialist demagogy and manoeuvres, while undermining any revolutionary liberation movement.

American imperialism and the other imperialist powers, together with social-imperialism, are well aware of these aims of China's. The countries of the «third world» also understand them, hence they are suspicious of China and see that it is working a bluff with them, that its aim is not to support and assist them, but to become a superpower itself. Most of the leaderships which are

ruling in the countries of the so-called third world, have long been linked closely with American imperialism or with the developed capitalist powers, such as Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Japan etc. Therefore China's flirtation with the «third world» does not worry the developed imperialist and capitalist states in the least.

China's efforts to join the «third world» through its policy and its ideology, the so-called Mao Tsetung thought, cannot succeed, also, because its ideology and political line are chaotic. The political line of China is confused, it is a pragmatic line which wavers and changes according to passing circumstances and momentary interests. The ruling classes in the states of the «third world» are not afraid of this ideology, because they understand that it is not for the revolution and the true national liberation of the peoples. In order to exercise its oppression and exploitation of these peoples more easily, the bourgeoisie in these countries has created its own parties under all sorts of labels. These parties, which are closely linked with the foreign capital invested in the states of the so-called third world, have no difficulty in combating and exposing the Chinese line. Therefore, the Chinese revisionist leaders have chosen a course of smiles towards the parties of these countries and are trying in every way and in every instance to be «as sweet as honey» with them.

Having its plan to dominate the «third world», China is doing its best to channel the movements of the working masses in that «world» in its own interests. Today, however, the oppressed peoples, with the proletariat at the head, are no longer in the situation they were at the end of the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century. They oppose any policy of hegemony and subjugation by the big imperialist powers, old or new, whether American, Soviet or Chinese. Today, the broad masses of the peoples of the world, in general, have awakened and, through their struggles, have managed in one way or another to gain a certain consciousness about defending their economic and political rights. The peoples of the so-called third world cannot fail to see that China is working not to carry the ideas of the revolution and national liberation to their countries, but to extinguish the revolution, which hinders the penetration of Chinese influence. The Chinese course of the alliance with the United States of America and the other neo-colonialist countries also exposes Chinese social-imperialism in the eyes of the peoples.

China cannot carry on positive revolutionary propaganda in the countries of the «third world», also, because it would come into collision with that superpower from which it is hoping to get investments of capital in China and advanced technology. China cannot conduct such propaganda, also,

because the revolution would overthrow precisely those reactionary cliques ruling in a number of countries of the so-called third world, which China is supporting and helping to stay in power.

The great ambition of the Chinese leaders to transform their country into a superpower as soon as possible and to establish its hegemony everywhere, especially in the so-called third world, has impelled them to make incitement of inter-imperialist war the basis of their strategy and foreign policy. They greatly desire a frontal clash between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in Europe, during which China, from a comfortable distance away, would warm its hands at the atomic holocaust that would destroy its two main rivals and leave it the all-powerful, sole ruler of the world.

Until it feels strong enough to compete with the other superpowers, until it wins the «place it deserves» as a superpower, China will seek peace for itself and war for the others. Connected with their present need for peace are the overt diplomatic manoeuvres of the Chinese revisionists to incite war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union in such a way that they themselves can keep out of it and get on with their «modernizations». Teng Hsiao-ping's declaration that there will be no war within 20 years,

is not fortuitous. With this he wants to tell the superpowers and the other imperialist countries not to be afraid of China during these 20 years. At the same time, the Chinese leaders are inciting war between the superpowers in Europe, far from China and the danger of its involvement in it. To what extent this will be possible is another matter, but the Chinese leaders are working in this direction, because they feel the indispensable need for peace for the period they think they need for the realization of their aims of transforming China into a superpower.

China is loudly advocating the strengthening of «European unity», «the unity of the developed capitalist countries of Europe». It supports this unity on all questions, presuming to teach the old wolves and foxes how they should strengthen their military and economic unity, their state organizational unity, etc., in face of the great danger from Soviet social-imperialism. But they have no need for these lessons from China because they are in a position to know, and do know very well, where the danger comes from.

The developed countries of the West are not so naive as to apply the Chinese advice and desires *«à la lettre»**. They are strengthening themselves to cope with an eventual danger from the Soviet Union, but at the same time, they are also making

* To the letter (French in the original).

considerable efforts not to aggravate their relations with it, not to go too far and anger the «Russian bear». This, naturally, runs contrary to China's desire.

China's incitement of their contradictions with the Soviets is to the liking of the capitalist states of Europe and the United States of America, because it enables them to tell the Soviets indirectly, «Your main enemy is China, whereas we, together with you, want to establish détente, peaceful coexistence, irrespective of what China says». On the other hand, while making believe that they want peace, these states are arming themselves to strengthen their hegemony and military unity against their main enemy — the revolution. This is the aim of all the meetings, such as those of Helsinki and Belgrade, which drag on and on endlessly, like the Vienna Congress after the defeat of Napoleon, which is known as the congress of balls and soirées.

The Chinese leaders, as Teng Hsiao-ping declared officially in the interview he gave the director of AFP, are calling for the creation of a «broad front which will include the third world, the second world and the United States of America», in order to combat Soviet social-imperialism.

The strategy of the revisionist leadership of China of instigating US imperialism, Western Europe, etc., to war against Soviet social-imperialism is fraught with the danger of a war between

China and the Soviet Union rather than a war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and its NATO allies.

What China is doing by inciting the others to war is precisely what US imperialism, the developed capitalist countries and all the other countries, where bourgeois capitalist cliques are in power, are doing, too, in inciting both China and the Soviet Union against each other. Therefore, it is most likely that the policy of the United States of America and the wrong strategy of China itself, may impel the Soviet Union to increase its military strength even further, and as the imperialist power it is, to attack China first.

On its part, China has a marked inclination to attack the Soviet Union when it feels strong enough, because it has great territorial ambitions towards Siberia and other territories in the Far East. It raised these territorial claims long ago, but it will push its claims rather more when it is ready, when it has built up an army equipped with all kinds of weapons. This is the implication in Hua Kuo Feng's statement to the former conservative Prime Minister of Britain, Heath, when he said: «We hope that we shall see a united and powerful Europe; we believe that on its part Europe, too, hopes to see a powerful China». In a word, Hua Kuo-feng says to the big European bourgeoisie: «Build up your strength and attack the Soviet Union from the West, while we, the

Chinese, will strengthen ourselves and attack it from the East».

The Chinese policy opened up a broad and very profitable avenue for the United States of America, an avenue which was initially opened up by Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and Nixon. Many bridges were built between the United States of America and China, camouflaged bridges, but effective and fruitful. Nixon preached: «We must build up a bridge long enough to link San Francisco with Peking». The invitation that Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai extended to Nixon after the Watergate scandal, and Nixon's reception by Mao were not without a reason and without a purpose. This meant that the friendship with the United States of America was not just a temporary friendship between persons, but a friendship between countries, between China and the United States of America, although the president who opened this road had been removed from his post for his corrupt practices.

Now that Carter has come to power, the ties of friendship between China and the United States of America are being consolidated. The United States of America is greatly interested in the present-day stand of China and Carter is encouraging its strategy in many ways.

The United States of America is interested in giving China all-round political, military and economic aid to incite it against the Soviet Union. It

has given China atomic secrets. This is now clear. The United States of America has also supplied it with the most up-to-date computers which serve nuclear war. China has received complete data so that it can build its own nuclear submarines. Now there is open official talk in Washington of supplying China with modern weapons. All these «blessings» the United States of America is offering China, naturally, are not given with the purpose of helping it become such a big land and naval power as to endanger even the United States of America, as Japan did during the Second World War. No, US imperialism carefully calculates the so-called aid it gives anywhere in the world, and especially to China.

In this way, the aim and feverish efforts of China to become a superpower which will counterbalance both the United States of America and the Soviet Union, cannot fail to lead to new frictions, conflagrations, wars, which may have a local character or the character of a general war.

The whole theory of the «three worlds», its entire strategy, the alliances and «fronts» it advocates, the objectives it seeks to achieve, are incitement to imperialist world war.

Nikita Khrushchev and the modern revisionists elaborated the ill-famed theory of Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence», which advocated «social peace», «peaceful competition», «the peaceful

road» of the revolution, «a world without arms and without wars». It was intended to weaken the class struggle by concealing and smoothing over the fundamental contradictions of our epoch. In particular, Khrushchev advocated the dying out of contradictions between the Soviet Union and American imperialism and the contradictions between the socialist system and the capitalist system in general. He fostered the view that, after the changes that had occurred in the world at that time, the historical contradiction between socialism and capitalism would be resolved through peaceful competition in the economic, ideo-political, cultural, and other fields.

«Let us leave it to time to prove and then we shall see who is right,» said Khrushchev, and in this competition the peoples «in sacred peace» would freely choose the most suitable regime. Nikita Khrushchev advised the peoples to sell their riches to the superpowers and wait to secure their freedom, independence and well-being as a result of this famous «peaceful» competition. Of course this anti-Marxist policy was exposed, and it was our Party that first attacked it.

The Communist Party of China has been following a policy like that of Khrushchev since the time when Mao Tsetung was alive. This policy, too, calls on both sides, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the peoples and their rulers, to cease the class struggle, to unite against Soviet social-

imperialism only, and forget about American imperialism.

The theory of «three worlds» is a reactionary theory just as Khrushchev's theory of «peaceful coexistence» was. But while Khrushchev and his followers, the champions of modern revisionism, on the face of it seemed to be pacifists, Mao Tsetung, Teng Hsiao-ping, Hua Kuo-feng, etc., present themselves openly as warmongers. They want to give the imperialist-capitalist coalition, in which China includes itself, the colour and significance of an organism of revolutionary struggle, a struggle for the victory of the proletariat and the liberation of the peoples. In reality, however, the «theory» of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China about the «three worlds» calls not for revolution but for imperialist war.

The exacerbation of contradictions and rivalries among imperialist powers and groupings is fraught with the danger of armed conflicts, of predatory wars of enslavement. This is a well-known thesis of Marxism-Leninism which history has proved to the hilt. Present-day international developments also demonstrate its correctness.

Many a time the Party of Labour of Albania has raised its voice to expose the deafening pacifist propaganda which the superpowers spread in order to lull the peoples and the freedom-loving countries to sleep and blunt their vigilance, in or-

der to bemuse them with illusions and catch them unawares. More than once it has drawn attention to the fact that American imperialism and Russian social-imperialism are leading the world towards a new world war and that the danger of the outbreak of such a war is real and by no means imaginary. This danger cannot fail to be a matter of constant concern to the peoples, the broad working masses, the peace-loving forces and countries, the Marxist-Leninists and the progressive people everywhere in the world, who, in the face of this danger cannot stand by passively and do nothing. But what should be done to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers?

This cannot be achieved through a course of capitulation and submission to imperialist warmongers, or of toning down the struggle against them. The facts have proved that the unprincipled compromises and concessions of the Khrushchevite revisionists did not make American imperialism any tamer, better behaved, or more peaceful, but on the contrary they made it more arrogant and voracious. But the Marxist-Leninists are not for pitting one imperialist state or grouping against the other, nor do they call for imperialist wars, for it is the peoples who suffer in them. The great Lenin pointed out that our policy is not aimed at inciting war, but at preventing the imperialists from uniting against the socialist country.

«...if we were really driving workers and peasants to war,» he said, *«that would be a crime. All our politics and propaganda, however, are directed towards putting an end to war and in no way towards driving nations to war. Experience has shown very clearly that the socialist revolution is the only way out of eternal warfare»**.

Hence, the only correct course is to raise the working class, the broad strata of the working people and the peoples in revolutionary actions to stay the hand of the imperialist warmongers in their own countries. Marxist-Leninists have always been and are the most determined opponents of unjust wars.

Lenin taught the communist revolutionaries that their duty is to smash the warmongering plans of imperialism and prevent the outbreak of war. If they cannot achieve this, then they must mobilize the working class, the masses of the people, and transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary liberation war.

The imperialists and social-imperialists have aggressive war in their bloodstream. Their ambitions to enslave the world lead them to war. But although it is the imperialists who unleash imperialist world war, it is the proletariat, the peoples, the revolutionaries and all progressives who

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 540 (Alb. ed.).

pay the price in blood. That is why the Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and the peoples of the world are against imperialist world war and fight relentlessly to foil the plans of the imperialists so that they do not drive the world to a new slaughter.

Hence imperialist war must not be advocated as the Chinese revisionists are doing, but must be combated. The duty of Marxist-Leninists is to raise the proletariat and the peoples of the world in struggle against oppressors to wrest their power and privileges from them and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. China is not doing this, the Communist Party of China is not working for this. With its revisionist theory, this party is weakening and delaying the revolution, splitting the vanguard forces of the proletariat, the Marxist-Leninist parties which will organize and lead this revolution.

The course which the Chinese leadership advocates is a fraud. It is a course which does not conform to our doctrine, Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, the Chinese revisionist line weakens, breaks up the proletariat and the peoples, threatens them with bearing the burden of a bloody war, an imperialist, a criminal war, so greatly detested by the proletariat and the peoples.

For this reason, too, Mao Tsetung's theory of «three worlds» and the political activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state

cannot in any way be called Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary.

When Khrushchev advocated economic, ideological and political competition between socialism and imperialism, the Chinese leaders were allegedly against this thesis and said that for genuine peaceful coexistence to be realized, imperialism must be fought, because «coexistence» cannot destroy imperialism, cannot lead to the triumph of the revolution and liberation of the peoples.

But these declarations remained only words on paper. In reality the leadership of the Communist Party of China has been and is also in favour of peaceful coexistence of the Khrushchev type. The document we quoted, «A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement», reads: «A principled policy is the only correct policy... What does a principled policy mean? It means that in laying down and elaborating any kind of policy, we must take the proletarian standpoint, must proceed from the basic interests of the proletariat and be guided by the theory and the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism». This is what the Communist Party of China stated, but what has it done and what is it doing now? It has done and is doing quite the opposite.

In the above mentioned document and on other occasions, the Communist Party of China has stated, «American imperialism must be ex-

posed as the greatest enemy of the revolution, socialism and the peoples of the entire world». Among other things it has added, «one must not rely on American imperialism, nor on any other imperialism, one must not rely on reactionaries». But the Communist Party of China has not implemented these theses. The Party of Labour of Albania, which bases itself firmly on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, resolutely upholds the struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism. It is precisely over this question that socialist Albania is in opposition to China, and the Party of Labour of Albania is in opposition to the Communist Party of China. The Chinese leaders level the accusation at us Albanians that allegedly we do not make a «Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and contradictions», and as a consequence, do not follow the Chinese line calling on «United Europe», the European Common Market and the proletarians of the world to unite with the Americans against the Soviets. Their conclusion is that since we do not support American imperialism, «United Europe», etc., we allegedly favour Soviet social-imperialism.

Not only is this stand of theirs revisionist, disguised under the cloak of «anti-revisionism», but it is also hostile and slanderous to socialist Albania. American imperialism is aggressive, bellicose and warmongering. The United States of

America does not want just the status quo, as the Chinese claim, it wants expansion. Otherwise there is no reason why it should have contradictions with the Soviet Union. The quotation of Mao, which they refer to, that «America has become like a rat with the whole world chasing it in the street, shouting: 'Kill it! Kill it!'», is intended to prove that only the Soviet Union wants war, while the United States of America does not. This softness towards the United States of America is to discourage any attack on this state, which «has been reduced to a rat» but which has to become China's ally. This is the anti-Marxist strategy of «the Marxist» Mao!

The Chinese «strategy», founded on their analysis based on the theory of the «three worlds», has «definitely» defined that «the rivalry between the two superpowers is centered in Europe». Strange! But why precisely in Europe and not in some other part of the world such as in Asia, Africa, Australia or Latin America, where the Soviet Union is seeking expansion?

The Chinese «theoreticians» do not explain this. This is how they «argue» their case: the chief rival of the United States of America is the Soviet Union. These two superpowers, of which one is for the status quo and the other for expansion, will unleash the war in Europe, as in the time of Hitler. He, too, wanted expansion and domination of the world, but in order to achieve this, he had

first to defeat France, Britain and the Soviet Union. For these reasons, Hitler started the war in Europe and not elsewhere. And further, the Chinese revisionists reason that Stalin relied on Britain and the United States of America. Then, the Chinese conclude, why shouldn't we, too, rely on the United States of America? But as we explained above, they forget that the Soviet Union linked itself with Britain and the United States of America only after Germany had attacked the Soviet Union and not before.

When the Germany of Wilhelm II attacked France and Britain, the heads of the Second International advocated «defence of the bourgeois homeland». Both the German and the French socialists fell into this position. How Lenin condemned this and what he said against imperialist wars is common knowledge. Now when they preach unity of the European peoples with imperialism in the name of defence of national independence, the Chinese revisionists, too, are acting in the same way as the partisans of the Second International. Contrary to the theses of Lenin, they are inciting the future nuclear war which the two superpowers are trying to launch, and issuing «patriotic» calls to the peoples and the proletariat of Western Europe to put aside their «petty» differences with the bourgeoisie (over oppression, hunger, murders, unemployment), to refrain from threatening its state power and unite with NATO,

«United Europe», the Common Market of the big bourgeoisie and the European concerns, and fight only against the Soviet Union, and become disciplined soldiers for the bourgeoisie. Even the Second International could not have done better.

But what advice has the Chinese leadership to offer the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other revisionist countries of the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon? None at all! It is rather quiet on this subject and takes no account at all of these peoples. From time to time it urges the revisionist cliques ruling in these countries to break away from the Soviet Union and unite with America. In fact it tells these peoples: keep quiet, submit, and become cannon fodder for the blood-thirsty Kremlin clique! This line of the Chinese revisionist leadership is anti-proletarian and warmongering.

All this shows that the Chinese leaders are deliberately complicating the international situations. They see these situations according to their own interests of making China a superpower and not according to the interests of the revolution. They see them from the angle of their imperialist state and not of the liberation of the peoples, from the angle of extinguishing the revolution in their own country and revolutions in other countries, and not from the angle of the organization and intensification of the struggle of the proletariat and the peoples against the two superpowers, as well as against the bourgeois capitalist

oppressors of other countries, they see them from the angle of inciting imperialist world war and not of opposing it.

China's course of becoming a superpower will have grave consequences, first of all for China itself and the Chinese people.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of the Chinese policy leads to the conclusion that the Chinese leadership is driving China into an impasse. By serving American imperialism and world capitalism it thinks it will draw some profits for itself, but these profits are dubious and will cost China dear. They will bring the country to catastrophe and, of course, will have considerable repercussions in other countries as well.

China's policy of becoming a superpower, which is inspired by an anti-Marxist ideology, is being exposed and will be exposed still more in the eyes of all peoples, but particularly the peoples of the so-called third world. The peoples of the world understand the aims of the policy of each state, whatever it be, socialist, revisionist, capitalist or imperialist. They see and understand that, though China poses as a member of the «third world», it does not have the same aspirations and aims as these peoples. They see that it is pursuing a social-imperialist policy. Therefore, it is understandable that this unpopular policy, which encourages social and national oppression, is unac-

ceptable to the peoples. It is a policy in the interests only of the reactionary cliques, of those who are dominating and oppressing the peoples.

China supports and supplies arms to Somalia which, at the instigation of the United States of America, is fighting Ethiopia. Meanwhile, Ethiopia is being supported by the Soviet Union to gobble up Somalia. This is what is happening with Eritrea, too. Thus, China takes one side, the Soviet Union takes the other. If anyone in Somalia looks on China with a kindly eye, it is those who are in power, but not the people of that country who are being killed. It is not looked on with a kindly eye either by the leadership of Ethiopia which has the support of the Soviets, or by the Ethiopian people, who are being egged on against the Somalis who allegedly want to occupy Ethiopia. Thus China has no influence at all, either in Ethiopia or in Somalia.

But it is not looked upon with a kindly eye in Algeria, either. The latter supports the «Polisario» front, whereas China takes the side of Mauritania and Morocco, that is, the side of US imperialism.

In its foreign policy China pursues an allegedly pro-Arab course. But this policy consists solely of the issue of uniting the Arab peoples against Soviet social-imperialism. Thus, it is self-evident that China assists every rapprochement of the Arabs with the United States of America, first of all.

In regard to Israel, the Chinese leadership has a great deal to say against it. But, in reality, with its strategy, it is pro-Israeli. The Arab peoples, and particularly the Palestinian people, have taken note of this.

In the countries of Asia, we may say that China has no obvious and lasting influence.

China is not in sincere and close friendship with its neighbour countries, let alone with the other, more distant countries. The policy of China is not and cannot be correct so long as it is not a Marxist-Leninist policy. On the basis of such a policy it cannot be in sincere friendship with Vietnam, Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, etc. China poses as wanting friendship with these countries, but, in fact, disputes over political, territorial and economic questions exist between China and these countries.

With the policy it is following, China has now come into open conflict with Vietnam. Grave incidents are occurring on the border between these two countries. The Chinese social-imperialists have been interfering seriously in the internal affairs of Vietnam, and are fanning up the conflict between Cambodia and Vietnam, etc., for their own expansionist objectives. When the Chinese leadership behaves in such a way towards Vietnam, which until yesterday it considered a fraternal country and close friend, what must the

Asian countries think about the Chinese policy? Can they trust it?

It would be a waste of time to speak about China's influence in the countries of Latin America. It has no influence there, either political, ideological or economic. The sum total of China's influence rests on its friendship with a certain Pinochet, who is a rabid fascist hangman. This stand of China has incensed not only the peoples of Latin America, but the whole of world opinion. They see that the Chinese leadership is pro oppressive rulers, pro dictators and generals ruling over the peoples, pro US imperialism which has gripped the peoples of this continent by the throat. Thus we can say that China's influence in the countries of Latin America is insignificant, without strength or substance.

The policy of the Chinese leaders does not enjoy the sympathy and support of the peoples, but on the contrary, will lead China to ever greater isolation from the progressive states and the world proletariat. No people, no proletariat or revolutionaries can support China's policy, when they see former German nazi generals, former Japanese militarist generals and admirals, Portuguese fascist generals, etc., etc., standing beside the Chinese leaders on the Tien An Men tribune, as happened on National Day, October 1, 1977.

China cannot go ahead with its course of transforming itself into a superpower without

intensifying the exploitation of the broad working masses at home. The United States of America and the other capitalist states will seek to secure superprofits from the capital they will invest there, they will also press for rapid and radical transformations of the base and superstructure of Chinese society in the capitalist direction. The intensification of the exploitation of the multimillion strong masses to maintain the Chinese bourgeoisie and its gigantic bureaucratic apparatus and to meet the repayment of the credits and interest to the foreign capitalists, will undoubtedly give rise to deep contradictions between the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, on the one hand, and the bourgeois-revisionist rulers, on the other. This will bring the latter into confrontation with the working masses of their own country, a thing which cannot fail to lead to sharp conflicts and revolutionary outbursts in China.

III

«MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT» — AN ANTI-MARXIST THEORY

The present situation in the Communist Party of China, its many zig-zags and wavering, opportunist stands, the frequent changes of its strategy, the policy the Chinese leadership has been and is following to make China a superpower, quite naturally raise the problem of the place and role of Mao Tsetung and his ideas, the so-called Mao Tsetung thought, in the Chinese revolution.

«Mao Tsetung thought» is a «theory» devoid of the features of Marxism-Leninism. All the Chinese leaders, both those who were in power before and those who have seized power today, have always made great play with the «Mao Tsetung thought», in their forms of organization and ways of action, their strategic and tactical aims, in order to put their counterrevolutionary plans into practice.

Seeing the dubious activity, wavering and

contradictory stands, the lack of principles and the pragmatism of Chinese internal and external policy, its deviation from Marxism-Leninism and the use of left phrases to disguise it, we Albanian communists have gradually formed our opinions and conviction about the danger presented by «Mao Tsetung thought». When our Party was founded, during the National Liberation War, as well as after Liberation, our people had very little knowledge about China. But, like all the revolutionaries of the world, we, too, had formed an opinion that it was progressive: «China is a vast continent. China is fighting, the revolution against foreign imperialism, against concessions is seething in China», etc., etc. We had some general knowledge about the activity of Sun Yat-sen, about his connections and friendship with the Soviet Union and with Lenin; we knew something about the Kuomintang, about the Chinese people's war against the Japanese and about the existence of the Communist Party of China, which was considered a great party, with a Marxist-Leninist, Mao Tsetung, at the head. And that was all.

Our Party had closer contacts with the Chinese only after 1956. The contacts steadily increased due to the struggle our Party was waging against Khrushchevite modern revisionism. At that time our contacts with the Communist Party of China, or more accurately, with its leading cadres, became more frequent and closer, especially when

the Communist Party of China, too, entered into open conflict with the Khrushchevite revisionists. But we have to admit that in the meetings we had with the Chinese leaders, although they were good, comradely meetings, in some ways, China, Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, remained a great enigma to us.

But why were China, its Communist Party and Mao Tsetung an enigma? They were an enigma because many attitudes, whether general ones or the personal attitudes of Chinese leaders, towards a series of major political, ideological, military, and organizational problems vacillated, at times to the right, at times to the left. Sometimes they were resolute and at times irresolute, there were times, too, when they maintained correct stands, but more often it was their opportunist stands that caught the eye. During the entire period that Mao was alive, the Chinese policy, in general, was a vacillating one, a policy changing with the circumstances, lacking a Marxist-Leninist spinal cord. What they would say about an important political problem today they would contradict tomorrow. In the Chinese policy, one consistent enduring red thread could not be found.

Naturally, all these attitudes attracted our attention and we did not approve them, but nevertheless, from what we knew about the activity of Mao Tsetung, we proceeded from the general idea that he was a Marxist-Leninist. On many of

Mao Tsetung's theses, such as that about the handling of the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as non-antagonistic contradictions, the thesis about the existence of antagonistic classes during the entire period of socialism, the thesis that «the countryside should encircle the city», which absolutizes the role of the peasantry in the revolution, etc., we had our reservations and our own Marxist-Leninist views, which, whenever we could, we expressed to the Chinese leaders. Meanwhile, certain other political views and stands of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, which were not compatible with the Marxist-Leninist views and stands of our Party, we considered as temporary tactics of a big state, dictated by specific situations. But, with the passage of time, it became ever more clear that the stands maintained by the Communist Party of China were not just tactics.

By analysing the facts, our Party arrived at some general and specific conclusions, which made it vigilant, but it avoided polemics with the Communist Party of China and Chinese leaders, not because it was afraid to engage in polemics with them, but because the facts, which it had about the erroneous, anti-Marxist course of this party and Mao Tsetung himself, were incomplete, and still did not permit the drawing of a final conclusion. On the other hand, for a time, the Communist Party of China did oppose US imperialism and

reaction. It also took a stand against Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism, though it is now clear that its struggle against Soviet revisionism was not dictated from correct, principled Marxist-Leninist positions.

Besides this, we did not have full knowledge about the internal political, economic, cultural, social life, etc. in China. The organization of the Chinese party and state have always been a closed book to us. The Communist Party of China gave us no possibility at all to study the forms of organization of the Chinese party and state. We Albanian communists knew only the general outlines of the state organization of China and nothing more; we were given no possibilities to acquaint ourselves with the experience of the party in China, to see how it operated, how it was organized, in what directions things were developing in different sectors and what these directions were concretely.

The Chinese leaders have acted with guile. They have not made public many documents necessary for one to know the activity of their party and state. They were and are very wary of publishing their documents. Even those few published documents at our disposal are fragmentary. The four volumes of Mao's works, which can be considered official, are comprised of materials written no later than 1949, but besides this, they are carefully arranged in such a way that they do

not present an exact picture of the real situations that developed in China.

The political and theoretical presentation of problems in the Chinese press, not to speak of literature, which was in utter disarray, had only a propaganda character. The articles were full of typically Chinese stereotyped formulas expressed arithmetically, such as «the Three Goods and the Five Evils», «the Four Olds and Four News», «the Two Reminders and Five Self-controls», «the Three Truths and Seven Falses», etc., etc. We found it difficult to work out the «theoretical» sense of these arithmetical figures, because we are used to thinking, acting and writing according to the traditional Marxist-Leninist theory and culture.

The Chinese leaders did not invite any delegation from our Party to study their experience. And when some delegation has gone there on our Party's request, the Chinese have engaged in propaganda and taken it here and there for visits to communes and factories rather than give it some explanation or experience about the work of the party. And towards whom did they maintain this strange stand? Towards us Albanians, their friends, who have defended them in the most difficult situations. All these actions were incomprehensible to us, but also a signal that the Communist Party of China did not want to give us a clear picture of its situation.

But what attracted our Party's attention most was the Cultural Revolution, which raised a number of major questions in our minds. During the Cultural Revolution, initiated by Mao Tsetung, astonishing political, ideological and organizational ideas and actions came to light in the activity of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese state, which were not based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. In judging their previous dubious actions, as well as those observed during the Cultural Revolution, and especially the events following this revolution up till now, the rises and falls of this or that group in the leadership, today the group of Lin Piao, tomorrow that of Teng Hsiao-ping, a Hua Kuo-feng, etc., each of which had its own platform opposed to the other's, all these things impelled our Party to delve more deeply into the views and actions of Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China, to get a more thorough knowledge of «Mao Tsetung thought». When we saw that this Cultural Revolution was not being led by the party but was a chaotic outburst following a call issued by Mao Tsetung, this did not seem to us to be a revolutionary stand. It was Mao's authority in China that made millions of unorganized youth, students and pupils, rise to their feet and march on Peking, on party and state committees, which they dispersed. It was said that these young people represented the «proletarian ideology» in China at that time

and would show the party and the proletarians the «true» road!

Such a revolution, which had a pronounced political character, was called a cultural revolution. In our Party's opinion, this name was not accurate, since, in fact, the movement that had burst out in China was a political, not a cultural movement. But the main thing was the fact that neither the party nor the proletariat were in the leadership of this «great proletarian revolution». This grave situation stemmed from Mao Tsetung's old anti-Marxist concepts of underestimation of the leading role of the proletariat and overestimation of the youth in the revolution. Mao wrote: «What role did the Chinese young people begin to play since the 'May 4th Movement'? In a way they began to play a vanguard role — a fact recognised by everybody in our country except the ultra-reactionaries. What is a vanguard role? It means taking the lead...»*.

Thus the working class was left on the sidelines, and there were many instances when it opposed the red guards and even fought them. Our comrades, who were in China at that time, have seen with their own eyes factory workers fighting the youth. The party was disintegrated. It was liquidated, and the communists and the proletariat were totally disregarded. This was a very grave situation.

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 3, p. 19 (Alb. ed.).

Our Party supported the Cultural Revolution, because the victories of the revolution in China were in danger. Mao Tsetung himself told us that power in the party and state there had been usurped by the renegade group of Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping and the victories of the Chinese revolution were in danger. In these conditions, no matter who was to blame that matters had gone so far, our Party supported the Cultural Revolution. Our Party defended the fraternal Chinese people, the cause of the revolution and socialism in China, and not the factional strife of anti-Marxist groups, which were clashing and fighting with one another, even with guns, in order to seize power.

The course of events showed that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian. It was a palace putsch on an all-China scale for the liquidation of a handful of reactionaries who had seized power.

Of course, this Cultural Revolution was a hoax. It liquidated both the Communist Party of China, and the mass organizations, and plunged China into new chaos. This revolution was led by non-Marxist elements, who have been liquidated through a military putsch staged by other anti-Marxist and fascist elements.

In our press Mao Tsetung has been described as a great Marxist-Leninist, but we never used

and never approved the definitions of the Chinese propaganda which described Mao as a classic of Marxism-Leninism, and «Mao Tsetung thought» as its third and higher stage. Our Party has considered the inflation of the cult of Mao Tsetung in China to be incompatible with Marxism-Leninism.

The chaotic development of the Cultural Revolution and its results further strengthened the opinion, still not fully crystallized, that Marxism-Leninism was not known and was not being applied in China, that in essence, the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung did not hold Marxist-Leninist views, regardless of the façade and the slogans they used about «the proletariat, its dictatorship, and its alliance with the poor peasantry», and many other such shibboleths.

In the light of these events, our Party began to look more deeply into the causes of the vacillations which had been observed in the stand of the Chinese leadership towards Khrushchevite revisionism, such as the instance in 1962, when it sought reconciliation and unity with the Soviet revisionists, allegedly in the name of a common front against American imperialism, or in 1964, when, continuing the efforts for reconciliation with the Soviets, Chou En-lai went to Moscow to hail the coming to power of the Brezhnev group. These vacillations were not accidental. They reflected the lack of revolutionary principles and consistency.

When Nixon was invited to China, and the Chinese leadership, with Mao Tsetung at the head, proclaimed the policy of rapprochement and unity with American imperialism, it became clear that the Chinese line and policy were in total opposition to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Following this, China's chauvinist and hegemonic ambitions began to become clearer. The Chinese leadership started to oppose the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples, the world proletariat, and the genuine Marxist-Leninist movement more openly. It proclaimed the so-called theory of the «three worlds», which it was trying to impose on the entire Marxist-Leninist movement as its general line.

For the sake of the interests of the revolution and socialism, and thinking that the mistakes observed in the line of the Communist Party of China were due to incorrect assessments of situations and to various difficulties, the Party of Labour of Albania has tried, more than once, to help the Chinese leadership correct and overcome them. Our Party has openly expressed its views, in a sincere and comradely way, to Mao Tsetung and other Chinese leaders, and on many of China's actions which directly affected the general line of the Marxist-Leninist movement, the interests of the peoples and revolution, it has made its remarks and disagreement known to the Central

Committee of the Communist Party of China officially and in writing.

But the Chinese leadership has never welcomed the correct and principled remarks of our Party. It has never replied to them and has never agreed even to discuss them.

Meanwhile the anti-Marxist actions of the Chinese leadership at home and abroad became more flagrant and more obvious. All this compelled our Party, like all the other Marxist-Leninists, to reappraise the line of the Communist Party of China, the political and ideological concepts by which it has been guided, its concrete activity and its consequences. As a result we saw that «Mao Tsetung thought», by which the Communist Party of China has been and is being guided, represents a dangerous variant of modern revisionism, against which an all-round struggle on the theoretical and political plane must be waged.

«Mao Tsetung thought» is a variant of revisionism, which began to take shape even before the Second World War, especially after 1935, when Mao Tsetung came to power. In this period Mao Tsetung and his supporters launched a «theoretical» campaign under the slogan of the struggle against «dogmatism», «ready-made patterns», «foreign stereotypes», etc., and raised the problem of elaborating a national Marxism, negating the universal character of Marxism-Leninism. Instead

of Marxism-Leninism he preached the «Chinese way» of treating problems, and the Chinese style «... lively and fresh, pleasant to the ears and eyes of the Chinese people»*, in this way propagating the revisionist thesis that in each country Marxism should have its individual, specific content.

«Mao Tsetung thought» was proclaimed as the highest stage of Marxism-Leninism in the present era. The Chinese leaders have declared that «Mao Tsetung has achieved more than Marx, Engels, and Lenin...». The Constitution of the Communist Party of China, approved at its 9th Congress, which was held under Mao Tsetung's leadership, says that «Mao Tsetung thought is the Marxism-Leninism of the era...», that Mao Tsetung «...has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism and has raised it to a new higher stage»**.

Basing the activity of the party on «Mao Tsetung thought» instead of on the principles and norms of Marxism-Leninism opened the doors even more widely to opportunism and factional struggle within the ranks of the Communist Party of China.

«Mao Tsetung thought» is an amalgam of views in which ideas and theses borrowed from Marxism are mixed up with idealist, pragmatic and revisionist principles from other philosophies.

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 4, p. 84 (Alb. ed.).

** The 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China, Documents, pp. 79-80, Tirana 1969 (Alb. ed.).

It has its roots in ancient Chinese philosophy, and in the political and ideological past, in the state and militarist practice of China.

All the Chinese leaders, those who have taken power at present as well as those who have been in and who have fallen from power, but who have manoeuvred to put their counterrevolutionary plans into practice, have had and have «Mao Tsetung thought» as their ideological basis. Mao Tsetung himself has admitted that his thoughts can be exploited by all, both by the leftists and the rightists, as he calls the various groups that comprise the Chinese leadership. In the letter he wrote to Chiang Ching on July 8, 1966, Mao Tsetung affirms, «the rightists in power might use my words to make themselves powerful for a certain time, but the left can use other words of mine and organize itself to overthrow the rightists»*. This shows that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, that his views are eclectic. This is apparent in all Mao's «theoretical works» which, although camouflaged with «revolutionary» phraseology and slogans, cannot conceal the fact that «Mao Tsetung thought» has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

A critical survey of Mao's writings, even of part of them, of the way he treats the fundamental problems concerning the role of the communist

* «Le Monde», December 2, 1972.

party, the questions of the revolution, the construction of socialism, etc., makes the radical difference between «Mao Tsetung thought» and Marxism-Leninism completely clear.

Let us first consider **the question of the organization of the Party and its leading role.** Mao pretended to be for the application of the Leninist principles on the party, but if his ideas on the party and, especially, the practice of the life of the party are analysed concretely, it becomes evident that he has replaced the Leninist principles and norms with revisionist theses.

Mao Tsetung has not organized the Communist Party of China on the basis of the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. He has not worked to make it a party of the Leninist type, a Bolshevik party. Mao Tsetung was not for a proletarian class party, but for a party without class restrictions. He has used the slogan of giving the party a mass character in order to wipe out the distinction between the party and the class. As a result, anybody could enter or leave this party whenever he liked. On this question «Mao Tsetung thought» is identical with the views of the Yugoslav revisionists and the «Eurocommunists».

Besides this, Mao Tsetung has always made the building of the party, its principles and norms dependent on his political stands and interests, dependent on his opportunist, sometimes rightist

and sometimes leftist, adventurist policy, the struggle among factions, etc.

There has been and there is no true Marxist-Leninist unity of thought and action in the Communist Party of China. The strife among factions, which has existed since the founding of the Communist Party of China, has meant that a correct Marxist-Leninist line has not been laid down in this party, and it has not been guided by Marxist-Leninist thought. The various tendencies which manifested themselves among the main leaders of the party were at times leftist, at times right opportunist, sometimes centrist, and going as far as openly anarchist, chauvinist and racist views. During the whole time Mao Tsetung and the group around him were at the head of the party, these tendencies were among the distinctive features of the Communist Party of China. Mao Tsetung himself has advocated the need for the existence of «two lines» in the party. According to him, the existence and struggle between two lines is something natural, is a manifestation of the unity of the opposites, is a flexible policy which unites in itself both loyalty to principles and compromise. «Thus,» he writes, «we have two hands to deal with a comrade who has made mistakes: one hand to struggle with him and the other to unite with him. The aim of this struggle is to uphold the principles of Marxism, which means being principled; that is one aspect of the problem. The

other aspect is to unite with him. The aim of unity is to offer him a way out, to reach a compromise with him»*.

These views are diametrically opposed to the Leninist teachings on the communist party as an organized vanguard detachment which must have a single line and steel unity of thought and action.

The class struggle in the ranks of the party, as a reflection of the class struggle going on outside the party, has nothing in common with Mao Tse-tung's concepts on the «two lines in the party». The party is not an arena of classes and the struggle between antagonistic classes, it is not a gathering of people with contradictory aims. The genuine Marxist-Leninist party is the party of the working class only and bases itself on the interests of this class. This is the decisive factor for the triumph of the revolution and the construction of socialism. Defending the Leninist principles on the party, which do not permit the existence of many lines, of opposing trends in the communist party, J. V. Stalin emphasized:

> «*...the communist party is the* **monolithic** *party of the proletariat, and not a party of a bloc of elements of different classes*»**.

---

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 560, Peking 1977 (French edition, first published by the Chinese this year).

** J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 11, p. 280 (Alb. ed.).

Mao Tsetung, however, conceives the party as a union of classes with contradictory interests, as an organization in which two forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the «proletarian staff» and the «bourgeois staff», which must have their representatives from the grassroots to the highest leading organs of the party, confront and struggle against each other. Thus, in 1956, he sought the election of the leaders of right and left factions to the Central Committee, presenting to this end, arguments as naive as they were ridiculous. «The entire country,» he says, «the whole world knows well that they have made mistakes in the line and the fact that they are well known is precisely the reason for electing them. What can you do about it? They are well known, but you who have made no mistakes or have made only small ones don't have as big a reputation as theirs. In a country like ours with its very large petty-bourgeoisie they are two standards»*. While renouncing principled struggle in the ranks of the party, Mao Tsetung played the game of factions, sought compromise with some of them to counter some others and thus consolidate his own positions.

With such an organizational platform, the Communist Party of China has never been and never could be a Marxist-Leninist party. The Leninist principles and norms were not respected

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 348, Peking 1977 (French ed.).

in it. The congress of the party, its highest collective organ, has not been convened regularly. For instance, 11 years went by between the 7th and the 8th congresses, and after the war, 13 years between the 8th and the 9th congresses. Besides this, the congresses which were held were formal, more parades than working meetings. The delegates tc the congresses were not elected in conformity with the Marxist-Leninist principles and norms of the life of the party, but were appointed by the leading organs and acted according to the system of permanent representation.

Recently, «Renmin Ribao» published an article by a so-called theoretical group of the «General Directory» of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China*. This article says that under the name of the «General Directory», Mao had set up around himself a special apparatus which kept the Political Bureau, the Central Committee of the Party, the cadres of the state, the army, the security service, etc., under surveillance and control. Entry to this Directory and knowledge of its work was forbidden to all, including the members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. Here plans for the bringing down or elevation of this or that factionalist group were worked out. The men of this Directory were present everywhere, they eaves-dropped,

* «Always Keep in Mind the Teachings of Chairman Mao», «Renmin Ribao», September 8, 1977.

watched, and reported independently, outside the control of the party. Apart from them, this Directory had at its disposal entire armed detachments, hidden under the name of the «Guard of Chairman Mao». This praetorian guard more than 50,000 strong went into action whenever the chairman wanted «to act with one blow», as has frequently occurred in the history of the Communist Party of China and as occurred recently with the arrest of «The Four» and their supporters by Hua Kuo-feng.

Under the pretext of maintaining contacts with the masses, Mao Tsetung had also created a special network of informers among the population who were charged with the task of keeping the cadres of the base under surveillance and investigating the conditions and state of mind of the masses, without anybody's knowledge. They reported directly to Mao Tsetung alone, who had severed all means of communication with the masses and saw the world only through the reports of his agents of the «General Directory». Mao said, «For myself, I am a person who does not listen to the radio, either foreign or Chinese, but only transmit». He also said, «I have stated openly that I shall no longer read the newspaper 'Renmin Ribao'. I told its Editor-in-chief, 'I do not read your paper'»*.

* From Mao Tsetung's conversation with comrades from our Party, Feb. 3, 1967. Central Archivals of the Party of Labour of Albania (CPA).

The article of «Renmin Ribao» provides new information which enables one to understand even more clearly the anti-Marxist direction and personal power of Mao Tsetung in the Chinese party and state. Mao Tsetung did not have the slightest respect for either the Central Committee or the congress of the party, let alone the party as a whole and its committees at the base. The party committees, the leading cadres and the Central Committee itself received orders from the «General Directory», this «special staff», which was responsible to Mao Tsetung alone. The party forums, its elected organs, had no authority whatsoever. The article of «Renmin Ribao» says, «no telegram, no letter, no document, no order could be issued by anybody without first going through Mao Tsetung's hands and being approved by him». It turns out that as early as 1953, Mao Tsetung had issued a clear-cut order: «From now on, all documents and telegrams sent out in the name of the Central Committee can be dispatched only after I have gone over them, *otherwise they are invalid*»*. Under these conditions there can be no talk of collective leadership, democracy within the party, or Leninist norms.

Mao Tsetung's unlimited power was so far-reaching that he even appointed his heirs. At one

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 96, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

time he had appointed Liu Shao-chi as his successor. Later he declared that his heir to the state and the party after his death would be Lin Piao. This, a thing unprecedented in the practice of Marxist-Leninist parties, was even sanctioned in the Constitution of the party. Again it was Mao Tsetung who designated Hua Kuo-feng to be chairman of the party after his death. Having power in his hands, Mao alone criticized, judged, punished and later rehabilitated top leaders of the party and state. This was the case even with Teng Hsiao-ping, who, in his so-called self-criticism of October 23, 1966, stated: «Liu Shao-chi and I are real monarchists. The essence of my mistakes lies in the fact that I have no faith in the masses, do not support the revolutionary masses, but am opposed to them. I have followed a reactionary line to suppress the revolution. In the class struggle I have been on the side not of the proletariat, but of the bourgeoisie... All this shows that... I am unfit to hold posts of responsibility»*. And despite these crimes which this inveterate revisionist has committed, he was put back in his former seat.

The anti-Marxist essence of «Mao Tsetung thought» on the party and its role is also apparent in the way the relations between the party and

* From the self-criticism of Teng Hsiao-ping. CPA.

the army were conceived in theory and applied in practice. Irrespective of the shibboleths of Mao Tsetung about the «party being above the army», «politics above the gun», etc. etc., in practice, he left the main political role in the life of the country to the army. At the time of the war, he said, «All the army cadres should be good at leading the workers and organizing trade-unions, good at mobilizing and organizing the youth, good at uniting with and training cadres in the newly Liberated Areas, good at managing industry and commerce, good at running schools, newspapers, news agencies and broadcasting stations, good at handling foreign affairs, good at handling problems relating to the democratic parties and people's organizations, good at adjusting the relations between the cities and the rural areas and solving the problems of food, coal and other daily necessities and good at handling monetary and financial problems»*.

So the army was above the party, above the state organs, above everything. From this it emerges that Mao Tsetung's words regarding the role of the party, as the decisive factor of the leadership of revolution and socialist construction, were only slogans. Both at the time of the liberation war and after the creation of the People's Republic of China, in all the never-ending struggles

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 4, p. 355, Peking, 1962 (French ed.).

that have been waged there for the seizure of power by one faction or the other, the army has played the decisive role. During the Cultural Revolution, too, the army played the main role; it was Mao's last resort. In 1967, Mao Tsetung said, «We rely on the strength of the army... We had only two divisions in Peking, but we brought in another two in May in order to settle accounts with the former Peking Party Committee»*.

In order to liquidate his ideological opponents, Mao Tsetung has always set the army in motion. He raised the army, with Lin Piao at the head, against the Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping group. Later, together with Chou En-lai, he organized and threw the army against Lin Piao. Inspired by «Mao Tsetung thought», the army has played the same role even after the death of Mao. Like all those who have come to power in China, Hua Kuo-feng, also, relied on and acted through the army. Right after Mao's death, he immediately roused the army, and together with the armymen, Yeh Chien-ying, Wang Tung-hsin and others, engineered the putsch and arrested his opponents.

Power in China is still in the hands of the army, while party tails behind it. This is a general characteristic of countries where revisionism prevails. Genuine socialist countries strengthen the

* From the conversation of Mao Tsetung with the Friendship Delegation of the PRA, Dec. 18, 1967, CPA.

army as a powerful weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to crush the enemies of socialism in case they rise up, as well as to defend the country from an eventual attack by the imperialists and foreign reaction. But, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, for the army to play this role it must always be under the direction of the party and not the party under the direction of the army.

At present the most powerful factions of the army, the most reactionary ones, which aim to turn China into a social-imperialist country, are making the law in China.

In the future, along with the transformation of China into an imperialist superpower, the role and the power of the army in the life of the country will steadily increase. It will be strengthened as a praetorian guard, armed to the teeth, for the defence of a capitalist regime and economy. It will be the tool of a bourgeois capitalist dictatorship, a dictatorship which, if the people's resistance is strong, may even assume open fascist forms.

By preaching the need for the existence of many parties in the leadership of the country, the so-called political pluralism, «Mao Tsetung thought» falls into complete opposition to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the indivisible role of the communist party in the revolution and socialist construction. As he declared to E. Snow,

Mao Tsetung considered the leadership of a country by several political parties, after the American model, the most democratic form of government. «Which is better in the final analysis,» Mao Tsetung asked, «to have just one party or several?» And he answered, «As we see it now, it's perhaps better to have several parties. This has been true in the past and may well be so for the future; it means long-term coexistence and mutual supervision»*. Mao regarded the participation of bourgeois parties in the state power and the governing of the country with the same rights and prerogatives as the Communist Party of China as necessary. And not only this, but these parties of the bourgeoisie, which according to him «were historical», should wither away only when the Communist Party of China also withers away, that is, they will coexist right up till communism.

According to «Mao Tsetung thought», a new democratic regime can exist and socialism can be built only on the basis of the collaboration of all classes and all parties. Such a concept of socialist democracy, of the socialist political system, which is based on «long-term coexistence and mutual supervision» of all parties, and which is very much like the current preachings of the Italian, French, Spanish and other revisionists, is an open denial

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 319, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

of the leading and indivisible role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the revolution and the construction of socialism. Historical experience has already proved that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist and socialism cannot be built and defended without the indivisible leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party.

> «*...the dictatorship of the proletariat,*» said Stalin, «*can be complete only when it is led by a party, the party of the communists, which does not and should not share the leadership with other parties*»*.

The revisionist concepts of Mao Tsetung have their basis in the policy of collaboration and alliance with the bourgeoisie, which the Communist Party of China has always applied. This is also the source of the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist course of «letting 100 flowers blossom and 100 schools contend», which is a direct expression of the coexistence of opposing ideologies.

According to Mao Tsetung, in socialist society, side by side with the proletarian ideology, materialism and atheism, the existence of bourgeois ideology, idealism and religion, the growth of «poisonous weeds» along with «fragrant flowers», etc., must be permitted. Such a course is alleged

* J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 10, p. 97 (Alb. ed.).

to be necessary for the development of Marxism, in order to open the way to debate and freedom of thought, while in reality, through this course, he is trying to lay the theoretical basis for the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and coexistence with its ideology. Mao Tsetung says, «...it is a dangerous policy to prohibit people from coming into contact with the false, the ugly and the hostile to us, with idealism and metaphysics and with the thoughts of Confucius, Lao Tze and Chiang Kai-shek. It would lead to mental deterioration, one-track minds, and unpreparedness to face the world...»*. From this Mao Tsetung draws the conclusion that idealism, metaphysics and the bourgeois ideology will exist eternally, therefore not only must they not be prohibited, but they must be given the possibility to blossom, to come out in the open and contend. This conciliatory stand towards everything reactionary goes so far as to call disturbances in socialist society inevitable and the prohibition of enemy activity mistaken. «In my opinion,» says he, «whoever wants to provoke trouble may do so for so long as he pleases; and if one month is not enough, he may go on for two, in short, the matter should not be wound up until he feels he has had enough. If

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 397, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

you hastily wind it up, sooner or later trouble will resume again»*.

All these have not been academic contributions to a «scientific» discussion but a counter-revolutionary opportunist political line which has been set up in opposition to Marxism-Leninism, which has disorganized the Communist Party of China, in the ranks of which a hundred and one views and ideas have been circulating and today there really are 100 schools contending. This has enabled the bourgeois wasps to circulate freely in the garden of 100 flowers and release their venom.

This opportunist stand on ideological questions has its roots, among other things, also in the fact that throughout the whole period from its foundation up till it achieved the liberation of its country and later, the Communist Party of China has made no effort to consolidate itself ideologically, has not worked to inculcate the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin into the minds and hearts of its members, has not struggled to master the fundamental questions of the Marxist-Leninist ideology and apply them consistently, step by step, in the concrete conditions of China.

«Mao Tsetung thought» is opposed to the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution.

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, pp. 405-406, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

In his writings Mao Tsetung makes frequent mention of the role of revolutions in the process of the development of society, but in essence he adheres to a metaphysical, evolutionist concept. Contrary to materialist dialectics, which envisages progressive development in the form of a spiral, Mao Tsetung preaches development in the form of a cycle, going round in a circle, as a process of ebb and flow which goes from equilibrium to disequilibrium and back to equilibrium again, from motion to rest and back to motion again, from rise to fall and from fall to rise, from advance to retreat and to advance again, etc. Thus, upholding the concept of ancient philosophy on the purifying role of fire, Mao Tsetung writes: «It is necessary to 'set a fire going' at regular intervals. How often? Once a year or once every three years, which do you prefer? I think we should do it at least twice in the space of every five years, in the same way as the intercalary month in a lunar leap year turns up once in three years or twice in five»*. Thus like the astrologists of old, on the basis of the lunar calendar, he derives the law on the periodical kindling of fire, on the development which goes from «great harmony» to «great disorder» and again to «great harmony», and thus the cycles repeat themselves periodically.

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 499, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

In this manner, «Mao Tsetung thought» opposes the materialist dialectical concept of development, which, as Lenin says

> *«...gives us the key to understand the 'self-movement' of every existing thing;... gives us the key to understand the 'leaps', 'the interruption of graduality', 'the transformation into the opposite', the abolition of the old and the emergence of the new»**,

with the metaphysical concept which «is lifeless, pale and dry».

This becomes even more obvious in the way Mao Tsetung handles the problem of contradictions, to which, according to Chinese propaganda, Mao has allegedly made a «special contribution» and developed materialist dialectics further in this field. It is true that in many of his writings, Mao Tsetung frequently speaks about opposites, contradictions, the unity of the opposites, and even uses Marxist quotations and phrases, but, nevertheless, he is far from the dialectical materialist understanding of these problems. In dealing with contradictions, he does not proceed from the Marxist theses, but from those of ancient Chinese philosophers, sees the opposites in a mechanical way, as external phenomena, and imagines the transformation of the opposites as a simple change

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 38, p. 396 (Alb. ed.).

of places between them. By operating with some eternal opposites taken from ancient philosophy, such as above and below, backward and forward, right and left, light and heavy, etc., etc., in essence Mao Tsetung negates the internal contradictions inherent in things and phenomena and treats development as simple repetition, as a chain of unchangeable states in which the same opposites and the same relationship between them are observed. The mutual transformation of the opposites into each other, understood as a mere exchange of places and not as a resolution of the contradiction and a qualitative change of the very phenomenon which comprises these opposites, is used by Mao Tsetung as a formal pattern to which everything is subject. On the basis of this pattern, Mao goes so far as to declare that «When dogmatism is transformed into its opposite, it becomes either Marxism or revisionism»*, «metaphysics is transformed into dialectics, and dialectics into metaphysics», etc. Behind such absurd assertions and this sophistical playing with opposites, lurk the opportunist and anti-revolutionary concepts of Mao Tsetung. Thus, he does not see the socialist revolution as a qualitative change of society in which antagonistic classes and the oppression and exploitation of man by man are abolished, but

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 479, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

conceives it as a simple change of places between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To confirm this «discovery», Mao writes: «If the bourgeoisie and the proletariat cannot transform themselves into each other, how does it come that, through revolution, the proletariat becomes the ruling class and the bourgeoisie the ruled class?... We stand in diametrical opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang. As a result of the mutual struggle and exclusion of the two contradictory aspects with the Kuomintang we changed places...»*. This same logic has also led Mao Tsetung to revise the Marxist-Leninist theory on the two phases of communist society. «According to dialectics, as surely as a man must die, the socialist system as a historical phenomenon will come to an end some day, to be negated by the communist system. If it is asserted that the socialist system and the relations of production and superstructure of socialism will not die out, what kind of Marxist thesis would that be? Wouldn't it be the same as a religious creed or theology that preaches an everlasting god?»**

In this way, openly revising the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism and communism, which, in essence, are two phases of the one type, of the one socio-economic order, and which are

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, pp. 399-400, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibid., p. 409.

distinguished from each other only by the degree of their development and maturity, Mao Tsetung presents socialism as something diametrically opposite to communism.

From such metaphysical and anti-Marxist concepts, Mao Tsetung treats the question of the revolution in general, which he regards as an endless process which is repeated periodically throughout the whole period of the existence of mankind on earth, as a process which goes from defeat to victory, from victory to defeat, and so on endlessly. Mao Tsetung's anti-Marxist concepts, sometimes evolutionist and sometimes anarchist, about the revolution are even more apparent when he deals with the problems of the revolution in China.

As emerges from his writings, Mao Tsetung did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory in analysing the problems and defining the tasks of the Chinese revolution. In his speech delivered at the enlarged working conference called by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in January 1962, he himself admits: «Our many years of revolutionary work have been carried out blindly, not knowing how the revolution should be carried out, and against whom the spearhead of the revolution should be directed, without a concept of its stages, whom it had to overthrow first and whom later, etc.». This has made the Communist Party of China incapable

of ensuring the leadership of the proletariat in the democratic revolution and transforming it into a socialist revolution. The entire development of the Chinese revolution is evidence of the chaotic course of the Communist Party of China, which has not been guided by Marxism-Leninism, but by the anti-Marxist concepts of «Mao Tsetung thought» on the character of the revolution, its stages, motive forces, etc.

Mao Tsetung was never able to understand and explain correctly the close links between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the proletarian revolution. Contrary to the Marxist-Leninist theory, which has proved scientifically that there is no Chinese wall between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, that these two revolutions do not have to be divided from each other by a long period of time, Mao Tsetung asserted: «The transformation of our revolution into socialist revolution is a matter of the future... As to when the transition will take place... it may take quite a long time. We should not hold forth about this transition until all the necessary political and economic conditions are present and until it is advantageous and not detrimental to the overwhelming majority of our people»*.

Mao Tsetung adhered to this anti-Marxist

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 1, p. 210 (Alb. ed.).

concept, which is not for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution, during the whole period of the revolution, even after liberation. Thus, in 1940, Mao Tsetung said: «The Chinese revolution must necessarily pass through... the stage of New Democracy and then the stage of socialism. Of these, the first stage will need a relatively long time...»*. In March 1949, at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, at which Mao Tsetung submitted the program for China's development after liberation, he says: «During this period all the elements of capitalism, of town and countryside, must be permitted to exist». These views and «theories» brought about that the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung did not fight for the transformation of the revolution in China into a socialist revolution but left a free field for the development of the bourgeoisie and capitalist social relations.

On the question of the relationship between the democratic revolution and the socialist revolution, Mao Tsetung takes the standpoint of the chiefs of the Second International, who were the first to attack and distort the Marxist-Leninist theory about the rise of the revolution and came out with the thesis that between the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution,

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 3, p. 169 (Alb. ed.).

there is a long period, during which the bourgeoisie develops capitalism and creates the conditions for the transition to the proletarian revolution. They regarded the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution, without giving capitalism the possibility to develop further, as something impossible, as skipping stages. Mao Tsetung, too, fully endorses this concept, when he says: «It would be a sheer utopia to try to build socialism on the ruins of the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal order without a united new-democratic state, . . . without the development of the private capitalist economy. . .»*.

The anti-Marxist concepts of «Mao Tsetung thought» about the revolution are even more obvious in the way Mao has treated the motive forces of the revolution. Mao Tsetung did not recognize the hegemonic role of the proletariat. Lenin said that in the period of imperialism, in every revolution, hence, also in the democratic revolution, the anti-imperialist national liberation revolution and the socialist revolution, the leadership must belong to the proletariat. Although he talked about the role of the proletariat, in practice Mao Tsetung underestimated its hegemony in the revolution and elevated the role of the peasantry. Mao Tsetung has said: «...the resist-

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 4, p. 366 (Alb. ed.).

ance to Japanese occupiers now going on is essentially peasant resistance. Essentially, the politics of New Democracy means giving power to the peasants»*.

Mao Tsetung expressed this petty-bourgeois theory in his general thesis that the «countryside must encircle the city». «. . . revolutionary villages», he wrote, «can encircle the cities. . . rural work should play the primary role in the Chinese revolutionary movement and urban work a secondary role»**. Mao expressed this idea also when he wrote about the role of the peasantry in the state. He has said that all other political parties and forces must submit to the peasantry and its views. «. . . millions of peasants will rise like a mighty storm, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. . .,» he writes. «They will put to the test every revolutionary party and group, every revolutionary, so that they either accept their views or reject them»***. According to Mao, it turns out that the peasantry and not the working class should play the hegemonic role in the revolution.

Mao Tsetung also preached the thesis on the hegemonic role of the peasantry in the revolution as the road of the world revolution. Herein lies

---

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 3, pp. 177-178 (Alb. ed.).

** Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 4, pp. 257, 259 (Alb. ed.).

*** Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 1, pp. 27-28 (Alb. ed.).

the source of the anti-Marxist concept that considers the so-called third world, which in Chinese political literature is also called «the countryside of the world», as the «main motive force for the transformation of present-day society». According to the Chinese views, the proletariat is a second-rate social force, which cannot play that role which Marx and Lenin envisaged in the struggle against capitalism and the triumph of the revolution, in alliance with all the forces oppressed by capital.

The Chinese revolution has been dominated by the petty- and middle bourgeoisie. This broad stratum of the petty-bourgeoisie has influenced the whole development of China.

Mao Tsetung did not base himself on the Marxist-Leninist theory which teaches us that the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie in general, is vacillating. Of course, the poor and middle peasantry play an important role in the revolution and must become the close ally of the proletariat. But the peasant class, the petty-bourgeoisie, cannot lead the proletariat in the revolution. To think and preach the opposite means to be against Marxism-Leninism. Herein lies one of the main sources of the anti-Marxist views of Mao Tsetung, which have had a negative influence on the whole Chinese revolution.

The Communist Party of China has not been clear in theory about the basic revolutionary guiding principle of the hegemonic role of the prole-

tariat in the revolution, and consequently it did not apply it in practice properly and consistently. Experience shows that the peasantry can play its revolutionary role only if it acts in alliance with the proletariat and under its leadership. This was proved in our country during the National Liberation War. The Albanian peasantry was the main force of our revolution, however it was the working class, despite its very small numbers, which led the peasantry, because the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the ideology of the proletariat, embodied in the Communist Party, today the Party of Labour, the vanguard of the working class, was the leadership of the revolution. That is why we triumphed not only in the National Liberation War, but also in the construction of socialism.

Despite the innumerable difficulties we encountered on our road we scored success one after another. We achieved these successes, in the first place, because the Party thoroughly mastered the essence of the theory of Marx and Lenin, understood what the revolution was, who was making it and who had to lead it, understood that at the head of the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, there had to be a party of the Leninist type. The communists understood that this party must not be communist only in name but had to be a party which would apply the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution and party building in the concrete conditions of our country, which would

begin the work for the creation of the new socialist society, following the example of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin. This stand gave our Party the victory, gave the country the great political, economic and military strength it has today. Had we acted differently, had we not consistently applied these principles of our great theory, socialism could not have been built in a small country surrounded by enemies, as ours is. Even if we had succeeded in taking power for a moment, the bourgeoisie would have seized it back again, as happened in Greece, where before the struggle had been won, the Greek Communist Party surrendered its weapons to the local reactionary bourgeoisie and British imperialism.

Therefore, the question of hegemony in the revolution is a very important matter of principle because the course and development of the revolution depend on who is leading it.

> «*Renunciation of the idea of the hegemony,*» stressed Lenin, «*is the most vulgar form of reformism*»*.

The negation by «Mao Tsetung thought» of the leading role of the proletariat was precisely one of the causes that the Chinese revolution

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 17, p. 252 (Alb. ed.).

remained a bourgeois-democratic revolution and did not develop into a socialist revolution. In his article «New Democracy», Mao Tsetung preached that after the triumph of the revolution in China a regime would be established which would be based on the alliance of the «democratic classes», in which, besides the peasantry and the proletariat, he also included the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. «Just as everyone should share what food there is,» he writes, «so there should be no monopoly of power by a single party, group or class»*. This idea has also been reflected in the national flag of the People's Republic of China, with four stars which represent four classes: the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie.

The revolution in China, which brought about the liberation of the country, the creation of the independent Chinese state, was a great victory for the Chinese people, and for the world anti-imperialist and democratic forces. After the liberation, many positive changes were made in China: the domination by foreign imperalism and big landowners was liquidated, poverty and unemployment were combated, a series of socio-economic reforms in favour of the working masses were carried out, the educational and cultural back-

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 3, p. 235 (Alb. ed.).

wardness was fought against, a series of measures were taken for the reconstruction of the country ravaged by the war, and some transformations of a socialist character were made. In China, where people died by millions in the past, starvation no longer existed, etc. These are undeniable facts, and are important victories for the Chinese people.

From the adoption of these measures and the fact that the Communist Party came to power, it appeared as if China was going to socialism. But things did not turn out that way. Having «Mao Tsetung thought» as the basis of its activity, the Communist Party of China, which after the triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution ought to have proceeded cautiously without being leftist and without skipping the stages, proved to be «democratic», liberal, opportunist, and did not lead the country consistently on the correct road to socialism.

The non-Marxist, eclectic, bourgeois political and ideological views of Mao Tsetung gave liberated China an unstable superstructure, a chaotic organization of the state and the economy which never achieved stability. China was in continuous disorder, even anarchic disorder, which was encouraged by Mao Tsetung himself with the slogan «things must first be stirred up in order to clarify them».

In the new Chinese state Chou En-lai played a special role. He was an able economist and

organizer, but was never a Marxist-Leninist politician. As the typical pragmatist, he knew how to implement his non-Marxist views and adapt them perfectly to each group that took power in China. He was a *poussah** who always managed to stay on his feet, although he always rocked from the centre to the right, but never to the left.

Chou En-lai was a pastmaster of unprincipled compromises. He has supported and condemned Chiang Kai-shek, Kao Gang, Liu Shao-chih, Teng Hsiao-ping, Mao Tsetung, Lin Piao, «The Four», but he has never supported Lenin and Stalin, Marxism-Leninism.

After liberation, as a result of the views and stands of Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and others, many waverings in all directions were observed in the political line of the Party. The tendency advocated by «Mao Tsetung thought» that the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution had to continue for a long time, was kept alive in China. Mao Tsetung insisted that in this stage the premises for socialism would be created parallel with the development of capitalism, to which he gave priority. Also linked with this, is his thesis on the coexistence of socialism with the bourgeoisie for a very long time, presenting this as something beneficial both to socialism and to the bourgeoisie. Replying to those who opposed such a

* French in the original (a popular type of Chinese doll).

policy and who brought up the experience of the October Socialist Revolution as an argument, Mao Tsetung says: «The bourgeoisie in Russia was a counterrevolutionary class, it rejected state capitalism at that time, organized slow-downs and sabotage and even resorted to the gun. The Russian proletariat had no choice but to finish it off. This infuriated the bourgeoisie in other countries, and they became abusive. Here in China we have been relatively moderate with our national bourgeoisie who feel a little more comfortable and believe they can also find some advantage»*. According to Mao Tsetung such a policy has allegedly improved China's reputation in the eyes of the international bourgeoisie, but in reality it has done great harm to socialism in China.

Mao Tsetung has presented his opportunist stand towards the bourgeoisie as a creative implementation of the teachings of Lenin on the New Economic Policy (NEP). But there is a radical difference between the teachings of Lenin and the concept of Mao Tsetung on allowing unrestricted capitalist production and maintaining bourgeois relations in socialism. Lenin admits that the NEP was a step back which allowed the development of elements of capitalism for a certain time, but he stressed:

---

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 338 Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

«. . . there is nothing dangerous to the proletarian state in this so long as the proletariat keeps political power firmly in its hands, so long as it keeps transport and big industry firmly in its hands».*

In fact, neither in 1949 nor in 1956, when Mao Tsetung advocated these things, did the proletariat in China have political power or big industry in its own hands.

Moreover, Lenin considered the NEP as a **temporary** measure **which was imposed by the concrete conditions** of Russia of that time, devastated by the long civil war, and not as a universal law of socialist construction. And the fact is that one year after the proclamation of the NEP Lenin stressed that the retreat was over, and launched the slogan to prepare for the offensive against private capital in the economy. Whereas in China, the period of the preservation of capitalist production was envisaged to last almost eternally. According to Mao Tsetung's view, the order established after liberation in China had to be a bourgeois-democratic order, while the Communist Party of China had to appear to be in power. Such is «Mao Tsetung thought».

The transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution can be real-

* V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 434 (Alb. ed.).

ized only when the proletariat resolutely removes the bourgeoisie from power and expropriates it. As long as the working class in China shared power with the bourgeoisie, as long as the bourgeoisie preserved its privileges, the state power that was established in China, could not be the state power of the proletariat, and consequently, the Chinese revolution could not grow into a socialist revolution.

The Communist Party of China has maintained a benevolent opportunist stand towards the exploiting classes, and Mao Tsetung has openly advocated the peaceful integration of capitalist elements into socialism. Mao Tsetung said: «Actually all ultra-reactionaries of the world are ultra-reactionaries, and they will remain such tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, they will not remain such unto death, and in the end they change... Essentially, ultra-reactionaries are die-hards but not stable... It may happen that ultra-reactionaries may change for the better... they come to see their mistakes and change for the better. In short, ultra-reactionaries do change»*.

In his desire to provide a theoretical basis for this opportunist concept, and playing on the «transformation of the opposites», Mao Tsetung said that through discussion, criticism and transformation, antagonistic contradictions are trans-

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 3, p. 239 (Alb. ed.).

formed into non-antagonistic contradictions, the exploiting classes and the bourgeois intelligentsia can turn into their opposite, that is, become revolutionaries. «However, given the conditions of our country,» Mao Tsetung wrote in 1956, «most of the counterrevolutionaries will eventually change to a greater or lesser extent. Thanks to the correct policy we have adopted towards counterrevolutionaries, many have been transformed into persons no longer opposed to the revolution, and a few have even done some good to it»*.

Proceeding from such anti-Marxist concepts, according to which with the lapse of time the class enemies will be corrected, he advocated class conciliation with them and allowed them to continue to enrich themselves, to exploit, to speak, and to act freely against the revolution. To justify this capitulationist stand towards the class enemy, Mao Tsetung wrote: «We have a lot to do now. It is impossible to keep on hitting out at them day in day out for the next fifty years. There are people who refuse to correct their mistakes, they can take them into their coffins when they go to see the King of Hell»**. Acting in practice according to these views of conciliation with the enemies, the state administration in China was left in the hands of the old officials. Chiang Kai-shek's generals

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 321, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibid., p. 512.

even became ministers. Indeed, even Pu Yi, the emperor of Manchu-kuo, the puppet emperor of the Japanese occupiers, was protected very carefully and turned into a museum piece so that delegations could go to meet and talk with him and see how such people were re-educated in «socialist» China. Besides other things, the aim of the publicity given to this former puppet emperor was to dispel even the fears of kings, chieftains, and puppets of reaction in other countries, so that they would think that Mao's «socialism» is fine and have no reason to fear it.

Stands which do not smack of class struggle have been adopted in China also towards those feudal lords and capitalists, who have committed innumerable crimes against the Chinese people. Elevating such stands to theory and openly taking counterrevolutionaries under his protection, Mao Tsetung stated: «... we should kill none and arrest very few... They are not to be arrested by the public security bureaus, prosecuted by the procuratorial organs or tried by the law courts. Well over ninety out of every hundred of these counterrevolutionaries should be dealt with in this way»*. Reasoning as a sophist, Mao Tsetung says that the execution of counterrevolutionaries does no good, that such an action allegedly hinders

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 323, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

production, the scientific level of the country, and will give us a bad name in the world, etc., that if one counterrevolutionary is liquidated, «we would have to compare his case with that of a second, of a third, and so on, and then many heads would begin to roll... once a head is chopped off it can't be restored, nor can it grow again as chives do, after being cut»*.

As a result of these anti-Marxist concepts about contradictions, about classes, and their role in revolution that «Mao Tsetung thought» advocates, China never proceeded on the correct road of socialist construction. It is not just the economic, political, ideological and social remnants of the past that have survived and continue to exist in Chinese society, but the exploiting classes continue to exist there as classes, and still remain in power. Not only does the bourgeoisie still exist, but it also continues to gain income from the property it has had. Capitalist rent has not been abolished by law in China, because the Chinese leadership has adhered to the strategy of the bourgeois-democratic revolution formulated in 1935 by Mao Tsetung, who said at that time: «The labour laws of the people's republic... will not prevent the national bourgeoisie from making profits...»**. In conformity with the «policy

* Mao Tsetung. Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 323, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

** Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 1, p. 209 (Alb. ed.).

of the equal right to land», the kulak stratum, in the forms which have existed in China, has retained great advantages and profits. Mao Tsetung himself gave orders that the kulaks must not be touched, because this might anger the national bourgeoisie with which the Communist Party of China had formed a common united front, politically, economically and organizationally*.

All these things show that «Mao Tsetung thought» did not and could not guide China on the genuine road to socialism. Indeed, as Chou En-lai declared in 1949, when secretly applying to the American government to help China, neither Mao Tsetung nor his chief supporters were for the socialist road. «China,» wrote Chou En-lai, «is not yet a communist country, and if the policy of Mao Tsetung is implemented properly, it will not become a communist country for a long time»**.

In a demagogic way, Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have subordinated all their declarations about the construction of the socialist and communist society to their pragmatic policy. Thus, in the years of the so-called great leap forward, with the aim of throwing dust in the eyes of the masses, who, emerging from the revolution, aspired to socialism, they declared that within

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 22, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

** «International Herald Tribune», August 14, 1978.

2-3 five-year periods, they would pass directly over to communism. Later, however, in order to cover up their failures, they began to theorize that the construction and triumph of socialism would require ten thousand years.

True, the Communist Party of China called itself communist, but it developed in another direction, on a chaotic liberal course, an opportunist course and could not be a force capable of leading the country towards socialism. The road it followed, and which was concretized even more clearly after Mao's death, was not the road of socialism, but the road of building a great bourgeois, social-imperialist state.

As an anti-Marxist doctrine, «Mao Tsetung thought» has substituted great state chauvinism for proletarian internationalism.

From the very first steps of its activity, the Communist Party of China displayed open nationalist and chauvinist tendencies, which, as the facts show, could not be eradicated during the succeeding periods, either. Li Ta-chao, one of the founders of the Communist Party of China, said, «the Europeans think that the world belongs exclusively to the whites and that they are the superior class, while the coloured peoples are inferior. The Chinese people,» Li Ta-chao continues, «must be ready to wage a class struggle against the other races of the world, in which they will

once again display their special national qualities.» The Communist Party of China was imbued with such views right from the beginning.

Such racist and nationalist views could not have been eliminated completely from the mentality of Mao Tsetung, let alone that of Liu and Teng. In the report which he delivered to the Central Committee of the Party in 1938, Mao Tsetung said, «Contemporary China has grown out of the development of the China of the past . . .We should sum up our history from Confucius to Sun Yat-sen. . . and take over this valuable legacy. This is important for guiding the great movement of today»*.

Of course, every Marxist-Leninist party says that it must base itself on the legacy of its own people from the past, but it also bears in mind that it must base itself not on everything inherited but only on what is progressive. Communists reject the reactionary legacy in the field of ideas, as well as in any other field. The Chinese have been very conservative, even xenophobic, in regard to their old forms, content, and ideas. They preserved the old as a treasure of great value. From the talks we held with them, it turns out that the Chinese placed little value on all the revolutionary experience of the world. To them only their own policy, their struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, their

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 2, pp. 250-251 (Alb. ed.).

long march, the theory of Mao Tsetung, were of value. As for the progressive values of other peoples, the Chinese considered them of little or no worth, indeed they did not take the trouble to study them. Mao Tsetung proclaimed, «the Chinese should cast aside the formulas created by foreigners». But precisely which of these formulas, he does not define. He has condemned «all the clichés and dogmas borrowed from other countries». Here the question arises: is the theory of scientific socialism, which was not worked out by the Chinese, also included in these «dogmas» and «clichés» alien to China?.

The leadership of the Communist Party of China considered Marxism-Leninism the monopoly of the Soviet Union, towards which Mao Tsetung and company nurtured chauvinist views, great state views, and had, you might say, a sort of bourgeois jealousy. They did not consider the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin the great fatherland of the world proletariat, on which proletarians of all the world had to rely in order to carry out the revolution, and which they had to defend with all their strength against the furious onslaught of the bourgeoisie and imperialism.

Decades ago, Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai, the two chief leaders of the Communist Party of China, spoke and acted in opposition to the Soviet Union which was led by Stalin. They even

spoke against Stalin himself. Mao Tsetung accused Stalin of subjectivism, saying, «he failed to see the connection between the struggle of opposites and the unity of opposites»*, that he allegedly made «a number of mistakes in connection with China. The 'Left adventurism' pursued by Wang Ming in the latter part of the Second Revolutionary Civil War period and his Right opportunism in the early days of the War of Resistance Against Japan can both be traced to Stalin»**, that Stalin's actions towards Yugoslavia and Tito were wrong, etc.

Although for the sake of appearances Mao Tsetung would now and then speak in defence of Stalin, saying that he was only 30 percent bad, in fact he mentioned only Stalin's mistakes. Mao's statement at the Moscow Meeting of the communist and workers' parties in 1957, when he said, «in Stalin's presence I felt like the pupil before his teacher, whereas now that we meet Khrushchev, we are like comrades, we are at ease,» is not fortuitous. With this he publicly hailed and approved Khrushchev's slanders against Stalin and defended the Khrushchevite line.

Just as the other revisionists, Mao Tsetung used the criticisms against Stalin in order to

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 400, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

** Ibid, p. 328.

justify his deviation from the Marxist-Leninist principles which Stalin consistently defended and further enriched. With their attack against Stalin, the Chinese revisionists intended to disparage his work and authority, to raise Mao Tsetung's authority to the rank of a world leader, a classic of Marxism-Leninism, who allegedly has always pursued a correct and infallible line! These criticisms also expressed their accumulated discontent against Stalin over the censure and criticisms he and the Comintern made of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and Mao Tsetung over their failure to implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism consistently on the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution, proletarian internationalism, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, etc. Mao Tsetung expressed this discontent openly saying, «Stalin suspected that ours was a victory of the Tito type, and in 1949 and 1950 his pressure on us was very strong indeed»*. Likewise, during his talks with us here in Tirana, Chou En-lai said, «Stalin suspected us of being pro-American or that we might go the Yugoslav way». Time has proved that Stalin was completely right. His forebodings about the Chinese revolution and the ideas guiding it turned out to be accurate.

The contradictions between the Communist

* Mao Tsetung, Selected Works, vol. 5, p. 328, Peking, 1977 (French ed.).

Party of China, led by Mao Tsetung, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Stalin, as well as those between the Communist Party of China and the Comintern, were contradictions over principles, over fundamental questions of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics. For instance, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China ignored the thesis of the Comintern on the correct and consistent development of the revolution in China, its orientation about joint action of the working class in the city and the liberation army, the theses of the Comintern on the character and stages of the Chinese revolution, etc. Mao Tsetung and the other leaders of the Communist Party of China have always spoken disparagingly of the delegates from the Comintern to China, calling them «stupid», «ignorant» people, who «did not know the Chinese reality», etc. Regarding each country as an «objective reality in itself», «closed to others», Mao Tsetung considered the assistance of the delegates from the Comintern unnecessary and simply impossible. In his speech to the Enlarged Working Conference of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in January 1962, Mao Tsetung said: «China, as an objective world, was known by the Chinese and not by the comrades from the Comintern who were engaged with the question of China. These comrades from the Comintern knew little or nothing about Chinese

society, the Chinese nation and the Chinese revolution. Thus why should these foreign comrades be referred to here?»

When speaking about their successes, Mao Tsetung leaves the Comintern out. Whereas for the defeats and deviations of the Communist Party of China, for the failure to understand and draw correct deductions from the situations which developed in China, he casts the blame on the Comintern and its representatives in China. He and other Chinese leaders accuse the Comintern of having allegedly impeded and complicated things for them in the waging of a consistent struggle for the seizure of power and the construction of socialism in China. But the facts of the past and especially the present Chinese reality confirm that the Comintern's decisions and directives about China were correct in general, and that the Communist Party of China did not act on the basis and in the spirit of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The consequences of the narrow nationalism and big state chauvinism which characterize «Mao Tsetung thought», that have been and are at the basis of the activity of the Communist Party of China, are also reflected in the stands towards, and activity of that party in, the international communist movement.

This is apparent concretely in the stand of the Communist Party of China towards the new

Marxist-Leninist parties which were created after the Khrushchevites' betrayal. From the very start the Chinese leadership had not the least confidence in them. This view was expressed openly by Keng Piao, the person in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, who makes the decisions on relations with the international communist movement. He has said, «China does not approve the creation of Marxist-Leninist parties and does not want the representatives of these parties to come to China. Their coming is a nuisance to us but,» he stressed, «we can do nothing about them, for we cannot send them away. We accept them just as we accept the representatives of bourgeois parties»*. Such a policy, which had nothing in common with proletarian internationalism, was followed at the time Mao Tsetung was alive, when he was fully capable of thinking and directing, hence it had his full approval.

When, contrary to the desires of the Chinese leaders, these new Marxist-Leninist parties began to grow strong, then they pursued another tactic, the recognition of all new parties and every group without exception and without any distinction, provided only that they called themselves «Marxist parties», «revolutionary parties», «red guards»,

* From Keng Piao's conversation with comrades from our Party in Peking, April 16, 1973, CPA.

etc. The Party of Labour of Albania has criticized this stand and tactic of the Communist Party of China. The other genuine Marxist-Leninist parties have done the same thing. Nevertheless, the revisionist Chinese leadership has continued on the same course.

Later, in conformity with their pragmatic policy towards the newly formed parties and groups, the Chinese leaders adopted differentiated attitudes. They called the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties their enemies, whereas the groups and parties which opposed these parties, came to be very dear to them. At present, the Chinese revisionists not only maintain ties with these anti-Marxist parties and groups, which laud «Mao Tsetung thought» to the skies, but also invite their representatives one by one to Peking, where they work on them, give them financial assistance and political and ideological instructions and brief them on how to act against the Party of Labour of Albania and the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties. They require them to propagate «Mao Tsetung thought», the theory of «three worlds» and, in general, the foreign policy of China, to create the cult of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping and condemn «The Four». To the Chinese revisionists, that party which meets these demands is «Marxist-Leninist», while those parties which oppose them are declared anti-Marxist, adventurist, etc.

All this shows that in their relations with the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Chinese revisionist leaders have not implemented the Leninist principles and norms which regulate relations between genuine communist parties. Like the Khrushchevite revisionists, proceeding from the anti-Marxist concept of the «mother party», they have resorted to dictate, pressure and interference in the internal affairs of the other parties, and have never accepted comradely advice and suggestions from sister parties. They have opposed the multilateral meetings of Marxist-Leninist parties, meetings to discuss the great problems of the preparation and triumph of the revolution, the fight against modern revisionism for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, to exchange experience and co-ordinate actions, etc. The reason for such a stand, among other things, is that they have been afraid to confront the genuine Marxist-Leninists in multilateral meetings, because their anti-Marxist and revisionist theories in the service of world capital and of the strategy intended to transform China into a superpower, would be exposed and unmasked.

Another indication of the anti-Marxist essence of «Mao Tsetung thought» is the relations the Communist Party of China has maintained and continues to maintain with many heterogenous fascist, revisionist and other parties and groups. Now it is striving to prepare the ground to infil-

trate or build relations also with the old revisionist parties of various countries, as for example those of Italy, France, Spain and the other countries of Europe, Latin America, etc. The Chinese revisionists are attaching ever greater importance to these relations because, ideologically, they are all in line with the Communist Party of China, regardless of the differences they have in tactics, which depend on the nature, strength and power of capitalism in each country.

The ties of the Communist Party of China with these traditionally revisionist parties will gradually be expanded, their actions will be concerted while it will continue to use the small groups, which call themselves «Marxist-Leninist» and follow the Chinese line, to fight and disrupt the existing genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, which remain unwavering in their stand, as well as the other parties which are being born or will be born. With these actions the Chinese revisionists are openly assisting capitalism, the social-democratic and revisionist parties, sabotaging the outbreak and triumph of the revolution and, especially, the preparation of the subjective factor, the strengthening of the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties which will lead this revolution.

The Communist Party of China applied this same tactic in its relations with the so-called League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which has

worked with all its might to split the international communist movement and has fought socialism and Marxism-Leninism relentlessly. The present Chinese leaders want to march together with the Yugoslav revisionists and co-ordinate their actions with them in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and all the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the revolution, socialism and communism.

Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have maintained a pragmatic stand towards Yugoslav revisionism and have made a great evolution in their views about Tito and Titoism. At first, Mao Tsetung said that Tito was not wrong, but it was Stalin who had been wrong about Tito. Then the same Mao Tsetung ranks Tito with Hitler and Chiang Kai-shek and says that «such people... as Tito, Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek and the Czar cannot be corrected, they should be killed». However, he changed his stand again and expressed his great desire to meet Tito. Tito himself declared recently: «I was invited to China when Mao Tsetung was alive. During the visit of the Chairman of the Federal Executive Veche, Djemal Biyedich, to China, at that time, Mao Tsetung expressed to him his desire that I should visit China. Chairman Hua Kuo-feng also told me that, five years ago, Mao Tsetung said that he should have invited me for a visit, stressing that in 1948, too, Yugoslavia was in the right, a thing which he (Mao Tsetung) had

declared even then, to a narrow circle. But, taking into consideration the relations between China and the Soviet Union at that time, this was not said publicly»*.

The revisionist leadership of China is loyally carrying out this «will» of Mao Tsetung. Hua Kuo-feng seized the opportunity of Tito's visit to China, and especially of his own visit to Yugoslavia, to eulogize Tito, to present him as a «distinguished Marxist-Leninist», a «great leader» not only of Yugoslavia but also of the international communist movement. In this way the Chinese leadership also openly endorsed all the attacks of the Titoites on Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, on the Party of Labour of Albania, the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism.

The close political and ideological relations of the Chinese revisionists with the Titoites, «Eurocommunists», like Carrillo and company, the backing they give the anti-Marxist, Trotskyite, anarchist and social-democratic parties and groups, show that the Chinese leaders, inspired and guided by «Mao Tsetung thought», are setting up a common ideological front with the renegades from Marxism-Leninism, against the revolution, against the interests of the peoples' liberation

* From Tito's speech at the meeting of activists of the SR of Slovenia, September 8, 1978.

struggle. That is why all the enemies of communism are rejoicing over the Chinese «theories», because they see that «Mao Tsetung thought», the Chinese policy, are directed against the revolution and socialism.

These questions which we have analysed do not cover all the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist content of «Mao Tsetung thought». However, they are sufficient to permit the conclusion that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist, but a progressive revolutionary democrat, who remained for a long time at the head of the Chinese Communist Party and played an important role in the triumph of the Chinese democratic anti-imperialist revolution. Within China, in the ranks of the party, among the people and outside China, he built up his reputation as a great Marxist-Leninist and he himself posed as a communist, as a Marxist-Leninist dialectician. But this was not so. He was an eclectic who combined some elements of Marxist dialectics with idealism, with bourgeois and revisionist philosophy, indeed, even with ancient Chinese philosophy. Therefore, the views of Mao Tsetung must be studied not only in the arranged phrases of some of his published works, but in their entirety, in their practical application, while also considering the practical consequences they have brought about.

In appraising «Mao Tsetung thought» it is

also important to bear in mind the concrete historical conditions under which it was formed. Mao Tsetung's ideas were developed at the time of the decay of capitalism, that is, at the time when proletarian revolutions are on the agenda and when the example of the great October Socialist Revolution, the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have become an unerring guide for the proletariat and the revolutionary peoples of the world. The theory of Mao Tsetung, «Mao Tsetung thought», which was born in these new conditions, had to try to deck itself out, as it did, in the garb of the most revolutionary and scientific theory of the time, Marxism-Leninism, but in essence it remained a «theory» opposed to the cause of the proletarian revolution and which comes to the rescue of imperialism in crisis and decay. Therefore, we say that Mao Tsetung and «Mao Tsetung thought» are anti-Marxist.

When one talks of «Mao Tsetung thought» it is difficult to discern a single clear line in it, since, as we said at the beginning, it is an amalgam of ideologies, from anarchism, Trotskyism, modern revisionism à la Tito, à la Krushchev, à la «Eurocommunist», and down to the use of some Marxist phrases. In all this amalgam the old ideas of Confucius, Mencius, and the other Chinese philosophers, who have directly influenced the formation of the ideas of Mao Tsetung, his cultural and theoretical development, also oc-

cupy an honoured place. Even those aspects of Mao Tsetung's views which come out in the form of a distorted Marxism-Leninism bear the seal and features of a certain «Asiocommunism» with heavy doses of nationalism, xenophobia and even Buddhist religion, and were bound to come into open opposition with Marxism-Leninism eventually.

The revisionist group of Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping, which is ruling in China today, has «Mao-Tsetung thought» as the theoretical basis and ideological platform for its reactionary policy and activity.

In order to strengthen its shaky positions, the group around Hua Kuo-feng and Yeh Chien-yi, which came to power, unfurled the banner of Mao Tsetung. Under this banner it condemned the Tien An Men demonstration and liquidated Teng Hsiao-ping, to whom they attached the label of the revisionist, which he deserved. Under this banner this group seized power in a putsch and smashed «The Four». However, the chaos which has always characterized China, continued at an even greater intensity. This troubled situation brought Teng Hsiao-ping to the fore and imposed his return to power, and he set out again on his course of right extremism with fascist methods.

Teng's objective was to strengthen the positions of his own group, to follow his undisguised course of alliance with American imperialism

and the reactionary world bourgeoisie. Teng Hsiao-ping brought out the program of the «four modernizations», put an end to the Cultural Revolution, liquidated all that mass of cadres promoted to the organs of state power, the party and the army by this revolution, and replaced them with the men of the blackest reaction, who have been exposed and condemned in the past.

Now we are witnessing a period which is characterized by the big character posters against Mao Tsetung with which Teng Hsiao-ping's followers are decorating the walls of Peking. It is the period of «revenge» which has two aims: first, to liquidate the «prestige» of Mao and eliminate the obstacle of Hua Kuo-feng and, second, to make Teng Hsiao-ping an all-powerful fascist dictator and to rehabilitate Liu Shao-chi.

Against this background of reactionary manoeuvres there are those in China, as well as abroad, who draw a comparison betwen Teng Hsiao-ping's struggle against Mao, who was never a Marxist-Leninist, and the crime of Khrushchev, who threw mud at Stalin, who was and remains a great Marxist-Leninist. No one, however little the brain in his head, can accept such an analogy.

The most correct comparison possible is that, just as Brezhnev and the revisionist group around him toppled Khrushchev, now, the Chinese Brezhnev, Teng Hsiao-ping, is toppling the Chinese Khrushchev, Mao Tsetung, from his pedestal.

This whole business is a revisionist game, a struggle for personal power. It has always been so in China. There is nothing Marxist about it. Only the Chinese working class and a true Marxist-Leninist party purged of «Mao Tsetung thought», «Teng Hsiao-ping thought», and all other such anti-Marxist, revisionist, bourgeois thoughts, will correct this situation. It is the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin which can rescue China from this situation through a genuine proletarian revolution.

But we are confident that one day Marxism-Leninism and the proletarian revolution in China will triumph and the enemies of the Chinese proletariat and people will be defeated. Of course, such a thing will not be attained without a fight and bloodshed, because it will take many efforts to form the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party in China, the leader indispensable to victory over the traitors and the triumph of socialism.

We are convinced that the fraternal Chinese people, the genuine Chinese revolutionaries will free themselves from illusions and myths. They will come to understand politically and ideologically that in the leadership of the Communist Party of China there are no Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries, but men of the bourgeoisie, of capitalism, who are pursuing a course which has no connection with socialism and communism. But, for the masses and the revolutionaries to under-

stand this, it is necessary that they realize that «Mao Tsetung thought» is not Marxism-Leninism, and that Mao Tsetung was not a Marxist-Leninist. The criticism we Marxist-Leninists make of «Mao Tsetung thought» has nothing in common with the attacks which are aimed at Mao Tsetung by the group around Teng Hsiao-ping in the struggle it is waging for power.

By speaking out openly and frankly about these questions, we Albanian communists are fulfilling our duty in defence of Marxism-Leninism, and at the same time, as internationalists, also helping the Chinese people and revolutionaries to find the correct path in these difficult situations they are going through.

THE DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM — A MAJOR DUTY FOR ALL GENUINE REVOLUTIONARIES

The present international situation is turbulent, the crisis in the capitalist-revisionist countries is getting worse, the aggressive policy of the superpowers more and more each day is creating new great dangers for the freedom and independence of the peoples and the general peace. The bourgeois and Khrushchevite, Titoite, «Eurocommunist» revisionist theories and, together with them, the Chinese theories, too, are part and parcel of the great strategic plan of imperialism and modern revisionism to destroy socialism and strangle the revolution.

In these conditions, the defence of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, a consistent revolutionary stand towards the major world problems, today constitute a fundamental task for our Party, as well as for all genuine Marxist-Leninists. Our just struggle must build up the confidence of the peoples and progressive mankind in the triumph of the

cause of the revolution, socialism and the liberation of the peoples. Our Party is on the correct road and it will triumph because the revolutionaries and the peoples of the world, and the Marxist-Leninist truth are on its side.

The Marxist-Leninists and the revolutionaries throughout the world see that the Party of Labour of Albania defends Marxism-Leninism when the others attack it, that it defends the principles of proletarian internationalism when the various revisionists have thrown these principles overboard. They see that in its stands the Party of Labour of Albania not only proceeds from the interests of its own country, but also expresses and represents very great interests, near and dear to the entire proletariat, the interests of genuine socialism, the interests of all those who base themselves on and are guided by Marxism-Leninism for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

At the same time, we notice that the policy China is following in its relations with US imperialism as well as with Soviet social-imperialism, is arousing doubts, discontent and constant criticism everywhere, especially in the countries of the so-called third world. This is natural, because the honest people in these countries see that the Chinese policy is not correct, that it is a policy which supports an imperialism which is oppressing them, that much of what the Chinese leaders preach does not conform to their deeds and the

concrete reality. The peoples see that China is following a social-imperialist policy which threatens their interests.

In this direction, too, our Party is also making its modest contribution. The peoples trust it because it speaks the truth, and the truth has its source in the Marxist-Leninist theory which has been concretely applied in Albania. The development of our country, its liberation wars, its social, economic, political and spiritual situation in the past, have much in common with many countries of the world which have suffered or are suffering the savage oppression of internal rulers and foreign imperialist rulers. The experience accumulated by our Party in the seizure of power by the people, in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the construction of socialism is a concrete example and aid to these peoples. The victories and successes achieved in the People's Socialist Republic of Albania have their basis in the Marxist-Leninist theory, by which it is inspired and which the Party of Labour of Albania applies in practice.

Apart from lackeys and ultra-reactionaries, no one is directly defending the bankrupt Chinese theory of «three worlds». The policy of rapprochement of the Chinese with US imperialism revives the spectres of imperialist wars which nobody wants to see, deepens the colonial and neocolonial darkness which nobody can endure, and

supports the capitalist exploitation which everyone wants to get rid of.

The Party of Labour of Albania has fought, is fighting and will always fight resolutely in defence of the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideas. It is and will always be against all those who strive to distort them and replace them with bourgeois, revisionist, counterrevolutionary ideas. Our Party is a proletarian party, a Marxist-Leninist party, an active participant in the world revolution, for which it is determined to make any sacrifice, just as it has done up till now. There is no force that can make our Party deviate from this fully internationalist, glorious and honourable course. There is no force which can intimidate or conquer it. Our Party cannot reconcile itself to any kind of opportunism, to any kind of deviation from Marxism-Leninism, to any distortion of it. It will fight with determination against Chinese revisionism, too, just as against revisionism of any other kind.

Ours is a Marxist-Leninist party, and because we are such a party, we must not be afraid to speak the truth openly. Our Party is small in regard to the number of members in its ranks, but it is a Party toughened in many battles. It has always had the courage to state matters openly in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, the revolution and socialism. The facts show that our fight against Chinese revisionism is correct, that

it is essential, therefore it is approved and supported by the genuine Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries.

A true revolutionary party, as our Party is, does not renounce its principled standpoints in any instance. We cannot retreat just because others might consider courage, the virtue of our Party, conceit. The Party has not taught its members to be conceited, but it has taught them to be always resolute and just and stern against the class enemy. On these questions there is no room for discussion about whether the party is big or small.

The communists, the genuine revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists must thoroughly understand how the situations are developing in the world today. They do not develop in a stereotyped form. If the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat and the experience of every genuine Marxist-Leninist party are studied, understood and assimilated properly, then these situations which are developing can be properly understood and the revolution will be given a powerful boost.

We Albanian communists must understand well that it is absolutely necessary to master Marxism-Leninism. The capitalist-revisionist encirclement and the pressure it exerts on us must never be underrated. We must not be foolishly

overconfident in our understanding of these questions and in the real fight we must wage against the enemies surrounding us.

The revolution has run into rocks and there are more ahead which must be blown up with explosives. Some must be blown up directly, some must be broken down piecemeal, while some others must be outflanked and then given the finishing blow. This is what understanding the strategy and tactics of the revolution means. In order to create confidence in the victory of the revolution, it is essential to organize the broad masses of the people, to make the proletariat conscious of the unwavering leadership of its genuine Marxist-Leninist party, because otherwise it may become involved in adventurist actions and compromise the victory of the revolution. The communists and the oppressed masses of the people have to realize that imperialism and world capitalism have great experience in oppressing the masses, in organizing the counter-revolution. Therefore, the tactics and strategy of the enemies, too, must be understood and coped with, because our ideology, our policy, our strategy and tactics are more powerful than any enemy, for they serve a just cause, the cause of communism.

Now for our Party, as well as for all the Marxist-Leninist parties in the world, the struggle against Chinese revisionism should be given the

greatest attention. This is an important question, but this does not mean that while dealing with it, we are permitted to forget Soviet revisionism, Titoite revisionism, or «Eurocommunism», which are very dangerous variants of modern revisionism. In regard to their tactics and strategy, all these anti-Marxist trends, regardless of the differences in their forms of struggle, are on the one course, have the same objective, and are waging the same struggle.

For all these reasons, we must never divert our attention either from the struggle which must be waged against American imperialism and all the reactionary capitalist bourgeoisie of the world or from the struggle against the Soviet, Yugoslav, Chinese, and other shades of revisionism. Despite all the contradictions they have among themselves, all these enemies are linked by the one cord — the fight against the revolution, against the Marxist-Leninist parties and their unity, against the general organization of the proletariat and the entire working masses in order to launch themselves into revolution.

The struggle against modern revisionism, and especially against Soviet, Titoite and Chinese revisionism, is not an easy matter. On the contrary, this struggle is and will be stern and protracted. For it to be waged successfully, for victories to be gained step by step, the communists, the cadres, the intelligentsia and all the working

masses of our country must be imbued with the ideology of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin and must also study the rich experience of our Party in the struggle against modern revisionism. Only in this way will we be able to overcome the obstacles and emerge unscathed from the great hostile forest with all its thorns.

As always, our Party of Labour must maintain clear, resolute, bold stands on the correct Marxist-Leninist line. This line of our Party, with its clearly defined objectives, will help to expose American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, as well as Chinese social-imperialism, and to wage the merciless struggle against them successfully.

The task of our Party, and of all the genuine communists of the world, is to fight with dedication to defend our Marxist-Leninist theory and cleanse it of all the distortions which the bourgeoisie, the modern revisionists and all opportunists and traitors make of it.

Marxism-Leninism is the triumphant ideology. He who embraces, defends and develops it, is a member of the glorious army of the revolution, of that great and invincible army of genuine communists, who are leading the proletariat and all the oppressed to transform the world, to destroy capitalism and to build the new world, the socialist world.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION 3
NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION 7

PART ONE

I

THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND MODERN REVISIONISM ..... 9—68

— THE STRATEGY OF WORLD IMPERIALISM 21
— THE STRATEGY OF SOVIET SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM 32
— THE STRATEGY OF CHINESE SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM 38
— THE ROLE OF TITOISM AND OTHER REVISIONIST TRENDS IN THE GLOBAL STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM AND SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM 50
— THE REVOLUTION — THE ONLY WEAPON TO DEFEAT THE STRATEGY OF THE ENEMIES OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE PEOPLES 64

II

THE LENINIST THEORY ON IMPERIALISM RETAINS ITS FULL VALIDITY ..... 69—140

III

THE REVOLUTION AND THE PEOPLES 141—251
— WE MUST DEFEND AND IMPLEMENT THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHINGS ON THE REVOLUTION 145
— THE PEOPLES' LIBERATION STRUGGLE — A COMPONENT PART OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION 173
— GENUINE REVOLUTIONARIES CALL ON THE PROLETARIANS AND PEOPLES TO RISE UP FOR THE NEW WORLD, THE SOCIALIST WORLD 212

PART TWO

I

THE THEORY OF «THREE WORLDS» — A COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY CHAUVINIST THEORY ..... 252—338
— THE CONCEPT OF THE «THREE WORLDS» — A NEGATION OF MARXISM-LENINISM 253

— THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHINESE REVISIONISTS TO CONTRADICTIONS IS AN IDEALIST, REVISIONIST AND CAPITULATIONIST ATTITUDE 276
— THE CHINESE VIEW ABOUT THE UNITY OF THE «THIRD WORLD» IS REACTIONARY 314
— THE CHINESE THEORY OF THE «THIRD WORLD» AND THE YUGOSLAV THEORY OF THE «NON-ALIGNED WORLD» SABOTAGE THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES 324

II

CHINA'S PLAN TO BECOME A SUPER-POWER ..... 339—383

III

«MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT» — AN ANTI-MARXIST THEORY ..... 384—453

THE DEFENCE OF MARXISM-LENINISM — A MAJOR DUTY FOR ALL GENUINE REVOLUTIONARIES ..... 454—461